

ORGANIZATION OF RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

On mid-1999 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) evaluating the No Action alternative (Alternative 1), and build Alternatives 2-5 was released for public review. Public comments received indicated a need to evaluate a build alternative smaller in scope with less impact to the surrounding environment. In response to these comments, FHWA developed a new alternative, Alternative 6, in a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) released in late 2000.

Public comments received on both the DEIS and SDEIS were entered into a database and assigned an identification number that permitted FHWA to track each individual comment. Due to the number of public comments received for both of these documents, they could not be included in this Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Instead, a list of all comments received and their identification numbers can be found under the tab labeled "Index." Copies of all public comments received on both the DEIS and the SDEIS are available for review at the locations listed at the beginning of Volume I of this FEIS. The DEIS and SDEIS public comments are found in a four-volume set and are organized by the assigned identification numbers. Please note that copies of inter-agency correspondence regarding proposed project have been included in Appendix A.

Because the public comments typically addressed similar issues, FHWA organized all comments into a total of 35 categories: 21 categories for the DEIS comments, 14 categories for the SDEIS comments. Some of these categories were further broken down into subcategories. FHWA has responded to each of the categories and corresponding subcategories in this Appendix. A complete list of the categories and subcategories and FHWA's responses to each of these can be found under the tab marked "Categories and Responses."

To determine how comments in individual letters were categorized, refer to the tab labeled "Index." The index lists all comments received in a spreadsheet. The comments are sorted first by the Comment Classification (Agency/Committees, Personal Communication, Public Hearing, Petition), then second by the name of the Agency or Committee (if applicable), and then by the Last Name and then First Name of the signatory. After having located a specific commentary, refer to the last column labeled "Category/Subcategory" to determine how the comment(s) were categorized. The numbers and letters found here refer to the categories and subcategories found under the tab "Categories and Responses."

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Alperstein & Covell, P.C.	Caswall	Edward, M.		Legal Representation	500	DEIS	1, 4(A)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Alperstein & Covell, P.C. (Represented by Faegre & Benson, LLP)	Fields	Leslie A.	Denver, CO	Legal Representation	501	DEIS	1, 3(F), 6(F), 9(D,G), 15(C,D), 16(C,E)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	American Discovery Trail	Hisgen	Harv	Golden, CO	Agent	682	DEIS	14(A,C)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	American Discovery Trail	Hisgen	Harv		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5074	SDEIS	14(A,C)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	American Lands Alliance	Savage	Harlin	Boulder, CO	Letter	480	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 3(A), 5(B), 12(D,E)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	American Lands Alliance	Savage	Harlin		Letter	5508	SDEIS	3(B), 5(E), 8(G), 9(B), 12(D,I), 17, 23(J), 24(A,B), 26, 28(E)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Bicycle Aurora	Tobiassen	Tom	Aurora, CO	Agent	696	DEIS	1, 14(A)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Bicycle CO, Denver Bicycle Touring Club, Bicycle Aurora	Tobiassen	Tom		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5070	SDEIS	26(B)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Cherokee Park Ranch	Unreadable	Christine	Livermore, CO	Letter	72	DEIS	2(B,C,D), 3(A,B), 4(E), 12(E)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Cherokee Park Ranch (duplicate from 8/13/99)	Unreadable		Livermore, CO	Agent	700	DEIS	2C, 3(A), 5(B), 8(F), 9(F)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Citizens to Save GP	Anderson	Coralue	Georgetown, CO	Comment Sheet	507	DEIS	1, 3(D,E), 6(A,B), 15(B)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Clear Creek County	Poirot/Sorenson/Watrous	Robert/Jo Ann/Fabian	Georgetown, CO	Agent	689	DEIS	1, 2(B,C), 3(A), 5(A,B), 7(A), 9(B), 16(C,D)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Clear Creek County Director of Economic Development	Stokes	Peggy		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5103	SDEIS	11, 22, 23(G)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Clear Creek County Unincorporated	Wagner	Tom		Agent	697	DEIS	1, 4(A), 12(H)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Clear Creek County(2 letters w/different topics)	Smith	Robert C.	Idaho Springs, CO	Agent	692	DEIS	2(H), 12(G,H,I)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Clear Creek County(2 letters w/different topics)	Smith	Robert C.	Idaho Springs, CO	Agent	693	DEIS	1, 2(C,D,E,F), 3(A,H), 4(C), 6(F), 12(D,H)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation	Stokstad	Peggy	Georgetown, CO	Agent	503	DEIS	10(A,B)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Clear Creek Economic Development Corporation (Duplicate from 9/7/99)	Stokstad	Peggy	Georgetown, CO	Agent	695	DEIS	1, 11, 12(H)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Coldwell Banker (Guest Ranch Specialist)	Callaway	Carolyn W.	Fort Collins, CO	Agent	674	DEIS	3(J), 5(A,B), 8(B), 9(F), 15(D)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Colorado Community First National Bank	Harris	Howard L.	Fraser, CO	Agent	681	DEIS	2(A), 5(B,C,E), 15(D)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Colorado Dude & Guest Ranch Association	Catlow	Wright M.	Labemash, CO	Agent	675	DEIS	3(A), 5(C)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Colorado Historical Society	Wolfe	Mark		Letter	5464	SDEIS	22, 28(C)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Colorado Mtn Club	Kummer	Phil		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5068	SDEIS	7, 26(A)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Colorado Mule Riders	Fortney	Gale W.		Agent	680	DEIS	15(D)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Colorado Wild	Smith	Rocky	Denver, CO	Agent	694	DEIS	1, 2(A,B,C,D), 3(A,H), 4(A), 5(A,B,D,E), 6(A,B,C), 7(A,B,D), 8(A,C), 9(B), 12(C,I), 15(B), 16(A,B,C,D)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Colorado Wild	Smith	Rocky		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5021	SDEIS	12(D,I)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Colorado Wild	Smith	Rocky		Letter	5751	SDEIS	16(D), 23(A,J,S), 24(A,B), 26(A), 28(D,E)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Consultant to Tumbling River Ranch – (6 letters with varying issues)	Nevius	William H.	Grant, CO	Letter	590	DEIS	1, 5(A), 6(A,E)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Consultant to Tumbling River Ranch - (6 letters with varying issues)	Nevius	William H.	Grant, CO	Letter	589	DEIS	1, 2(D), 3(A), 6(A,B,E)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Consultant to Tumbling River Ranch – (6 letters with varying issues)	Nevius	William H.	Grant, CO	Letter	591	DEIS	1, 15(D)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Consultant to Tumbling River Ranch – (6 letters with varying issues)	Nevius	William H.	Grant, CO	Letter	592	DEIS	1, 3(H)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Consultant to Tumbling River Ranch – (6 letters with varying issues)	Nevius	William H.	Grant, CO	Letter	593	DEIS	6(A)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Consultant to Tumbling River Ranch – (6 letters with varying issues)	Nevius	William H.	Grant, CO	Letter	594	DEIS	1, 2(A), 9(G), 15(D), 16(B,C,E)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	East Mt. Evans Resource Growth & Development	Andrew	Mel		Personal Letter	5304	SDEIS	23(A,I), 24(A), 28(D)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Evergreen Audobon Society/Rocky Mtn. Chapter of the Sierra Club	Armbrust	Lewis	Evergreen, CO	Letter	29	DEIS	2(B,C,D), 4(E), 8(G), 13(A)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Fall River Homeowners Association	Arnold	Bill	Idaho Springs, CO	Agent	672	DEIS	2(A,B,D), 4(E), 7(D), 15(B)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Georgetown Loop Railroad	Ashby	Rosa	Lakewood, CO	Form Letter #3	5341	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Georgetown Loop Railroad	Greksa	Leah		Form Letter #3	5525	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Georgetown Loop Railroad	Greksa	Mark		Form Letter #3	5527	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Georgetown Loop Railroad Inc.	Greksa	Mark and Leah	Georgetown, CO	Letter	156	DEIS	2(A,B,D,E), 3(J), 5(B,C), 9(F), 12(D,I), 14(A)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Georgetown Loop Railroad, Inc.	Ropchan	David	Golden, CO	Comment Sheet	204	DEIS	3(H), 5(E), 8(F), 15(B)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Georgetown, Board of Selectmen, Ward 1	Bradley	Christine	Georgetown, CO	Letter	34	DEIS	1, 4(A), 7(A,C,E), 15(B)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Historic Georgetown, Inc	Neely	Ronald J.	Georgetown, CO	Agent	687	DEIS	1, 3(H), 8(D), 12(D)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Jessup Family and Staff of Sylvan Dale Ranch	Jessup	Susan	Loveland, CO	Letter	47	DEIS	3(A,D,F,J), 8(B,C,E), 15(D), 16(C,E)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Kay El Bar Guest Ranch	Loftis	John	Wickenburg, AZ	Letter	50	DEIS	2(A,D,E), 3(A,F,J), 4(E)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Kay el Bar Guest Ranch	Loftis	John	Lakewood, CO	Letter	5190	SDEIS	3(A), 17, 24(B), 26
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Kilgore Ranch Company	Kilgore	Eugene	Tahoe City, CA	Letter	48	DEIS	3(A,B,C,D,E), 5(A,B,E), 12(A), 16(C)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Kilgore Ranch Company	Kilgore	Eugene S.	Tahoe City, CA	Agent	685	DEIS	3(F), 5(B,C), 12(A), 15(D)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Kilgore Ranch Company	Kilgore, III	Eugene S.	Tahoe City, CA	Letter	5457	SDEIS	2(A), 3(A), 12(A), 15(C)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Lake Mancos Ranch	Sehnert	Kathryn	Mancos, CO	Letter	63	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 5(A,D,E), 8(E), 9(F)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Lowe, Gray, Steele & Darko, LLP	Shively	Margaret	Indianapolis, IN	Letter	66	DEIS	3(B), 4(A,E), 8(E)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Mountain Parks Bank	Brumbelow	Norman R.	Fairplay, CO	Agent	673	DEIS	15(D)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	National Audubon Society	Kirkpatrick	Susan	Boulder, CO	Letter	5432	SDEIS	2(A), 12(A), 24(A)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Naylor Lake Fishing Club	Davia	David, Richard Valori, Jim Jordan, Phil Buckland,		Letter	5451	SDEIS	10(A,B,C)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	North Fork Guest Ranch	May	Dean	Shawnee, CO	Letter	51	DEIS	4(A,E), 5(A,E), 8(D,E), 9C, 15(D), 16(A,B,C,D)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	North Fork Guest Ranch	May	Dean G.	Shawnee, CO	Agent	686	DEIS	3(D), 4(A,E), 15(B,D), 16(C,E)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	NWF	Gilbert	Monique	Montpelier, VT	Letter	41	DEIS	2(A,B,C,D,E), 5(B), 9(F), 12(E,I)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	President, Zinn Cycles	Zinn	Lennard		E-Mail	527	DEIS	14(A)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Rawah Ranch	Kunz	Pete and Ardythe	Jelm, WY	Letter	162	DEIS	2(C), 3(A,B,F), 5(B), 8(E), 15(C)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Selected Properties International, Inc.	Fawcett	H. Bob	Denver, CO	Agent	678	DEIS	2(A,B), 3(D,F), 4(E), 5(A), 9(F), 15(D)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Sierra Club	Armbrust	Lewis	Evergreen, CO	Comment Sheet	2	DEIS	2(A,C,E), 9(C)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Sierra Club	Bacigalupi	Tod		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5015	SDEIS	2(A), 3(A), 23(L), 28(A)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Sierra Club	Banta	Eric		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5066	SDEIS	7(D), 12(D), 30
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Sierra Club	Casini, LeFever	Greg, Susan		Letter	5455	SDEIS	23(J), 24(B), 26(A), 29
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Sierra Club, Mt. Evans Group	Yarroll	Lyn	Evergreen, CO	Agent	502	DEIS	13(B)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Sierra Club, Mt. Evans Group	Yarroll	Lyn	Evergreen, CO	Agent	701	DEIS	1, 2(A,B,C,D,F), 3(A,E,H), 4(A), 5(B,E), 6(A,B,C,E), 7(A,B,D), 8(C), 9(B), 12(I), 16(A,B,C,D)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Sierra Club, Mt. Evans Group	Yarroll and Bacigalupi	Lyn and Tod		Letter	5510	SDEIS	2(A,B,C,D,E), 3(A), 5(E), 9(B), 12(A,D,I), 16(B,D), 23(O,P), 24(A,B), 26, 28(D,E), 29(A,B,D)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Sierra Club, Pikes Peak Group	Lockhart	James E.		Letter	5463	SDEIS	2(A,D), 8(G), 12(D), 17, 24(A,I), 28, 29(A)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	State of Colorado, Division of Wildlife	Hoover	Scott	Denver, CO	Agency Letter	5227	SDEIS	2(A,C), 28C, 29(A)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	State of Colorado, Division of Wildlife	Weber	Dave	Denver, CO	Agent	699	DEIS	1, 2(A,B,C), 8(D), 16(B)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	State of Colorado, Division of Wildlife	Weber	Dave	Denver, CO	Agent	710	DEIS	1, 2(A,B,C), 8(D), 16(B)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Tarryall River Ranch	Baxter	Debra	Lake George, CO	Letter	49	DEIS	1, 2(A,B,C), 3(A,B,F,I,J), 5(C,E), 8(D), 9(D,E), 12(A,H), 15(C,E)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Tarryall River Ranch	Fagerstrom	James	Lake George, CO	Letter	49	DEIS	1, 2(A,B,C), 3(A,B,F,I,J), 5(C,E), 8(D), 9(D,E), 12(A,H), 15(C,E)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Tarryall River Ranch	Lahrman	James & Jeannine	Lake George, CO	Letter	49	DEIS	1, 2(A,B,C), 3(A,B,F,I,J), 5(C,E), 8(D), 9(D,E), 12(A,H), 15(C,E)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	The Burlington Ditch, Reservoir and Land Co.	Wall	Harlan	Brighton, CO	Agent	698	DEIS	10(A), 11, 18
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	The Colorado Mountain Club	Neuman/Smith	Claude/Vera	Golden, CO	Agent	688	DEIS	2(B,C), 3(A,H), 4(A), 7(A), 9(C,F)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	The Denver Bicycle Touring Club, Inc.	Cole	Rex E.	Denver, CO	Agent	677	DEIS	14(A)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	The Evergreen Naturalists Audubon Society, Inc	Simon	Kent		Letter	5461	SDEIS	2(D), 3(A,C), 9, 12(E), 23, 24(B,C), 26(A), 29(A)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	The Evergreen Naturalists Audubon Society, Inc.	Price/Jones	Lynne/Dave	Evergreen, CO	Agent	690	DEIS	1, 2(B,C,D,G), 3(A), 5(A,B), 7(B,C,D), 9(B,F), 12(I)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Town of Georgetown/Board of Selectmen	Claus	Janet	Georgetown, CO	Agent	154	DEIS	2(A,B,C,D), 3(H), 4(A), 7(A,E,G), 12(A,D,E,I), 15(B), 16(A,B,C,D)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Town of Georgetown/Board of Selectmen	Claus	Janet	Georgetown, CO	Agent	504	DEIS	1, 2(A), 3(H), 4(A), 12(E), 15(B), 16(D)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Trailhead Wilderness School	Ventimiglia	David	Georgetown, CO	Letter	170	DEIS	7(A)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Tumbling River Ranch	Dougan	Scott		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5077	SDEIS	3(A), 4(E), 12(A), 26(A)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	University of the Wilderness	Mounsey	William Bird		Letter	5491	SDEIS	2(A), 8(G), 24(B), 29(A)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Upper Arkansas & South Platte Project	Smith	Jean C.	Dener, CO	Agent	1A	DEIS	2(c), 3(A,B,F),19
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Upper Arkansas and South Platte Project	Smith	Jean C.	Denver, CO	Agent	691	DEIS	1, 2(A,B,C,D), 3(A,B,F,G), 5(A,B,E), 6(A), 7(A,D), 15(B,D), 16(C)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Upper Arkansas and South Platte Project	Smith	Jean C.	Denver, CO	12/6/00 Public Hearing	5083	SDEIS	23(S,U)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Upper Arkansas and South Platte Project	Smith	Jean C.	Denver, CO	Letter	5465	SDEIS	2(A,C), 7(A), 12(D), 16(D), 23(O,Q), 24(A), 28(A,D)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	US Dept. of the Interior	Taylor	Willie, R.	Washington, D.C.	Agent	505	DEIS	1, 3(H)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	US DOT/ FHWA	Kane	Anthony R.		Agent	684	DEIS	7(B)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	US EPA	Cody	Cynthia	Denver, CO	Agent	676	DEIS	1, 2(B,C)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	US EPA	Cody	Cynthia	Denver, CO	Agent	5811	SDEIS	1, 2(B,C)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Vista Verde	Munn	John	Steamboat Springs, CO	Letter	54	DEIS	1, 2(B,C), 3(A), 5(A,B,C,D), 8(), 9(F)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Water shed Administration	Jones	Bob		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5101	SDEIS	11, 23(A), 26(B)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Waunita Hot Springs Ranch	Pringle	Rod, Junelle, Ryan, Tammy	Gunnison, CO	Letter	60	DEIS	2(A), 8 (D,E)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Westcliffe Publishers	Fielder	John	Englewood, CO	Agent	679	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 3(A,J), 5(B), 8(C,E)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Western Pacific Art Co.	Pugh	W.A.	Georgetown, CO	Comment Sheet	18	DEIS	2(A,E), 3(A,E,H), 5(D)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Wilderness Society, The	Jones	Suzanne		Letter	5509	SDEIS	2(E), 3(B), 8(G), 9(C), 15(B), 23(E,F,J,G,N,Z), 24(A), 26, 33
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Wilderness Society, The	Jones/Morton	Suzanne/Dr. Pete	Denver, CO	Agent	683	DEIS	1, 2(A,B,C,D,E), 3(A,C,H,J), 5(B), 6(A), 9(B,C), 12(I), 15(B), 16(B,C,E)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Audubon Society of Greater Denver	Reetz	Pauline P.	Littleton, CO	Letter	5435	SDEIS	2(A), 3(A), 12(D), 23(AA), 24(A), 26(A), 28(B,D)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Bicycle Aurora	Tobiassen	Tom		Personal Email	5287	SDEIS	10(A,B), 14(A), 18
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Clear Creek County Economic Development Corp.	Stokstad	Peggy	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	5212	SDEIS	11, 22
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Consultant to Tumbling River Ranch	Nevius	William H.	Grant, CO	Personal Letter	166	DEIS	6(B,C)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Consultant to Tumbling River Ranch	Nevius	William H.	Grant, CO	Personal Letter	5219	SDEIS	15(C,D), 23(B,L), 28(A)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Georgetown Motor Inn	Williams	Marie-Claude and Tom	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	5298	SDEIS	8(G), 26(A), 33
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Georgetown Motor Inn	Williams	Marie-Claude and Tom	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	5365	SDEIS	3(A), 26(A), 33

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Rollinsville Community Church	Whitman	Forrest	Rollinsville	Personal Letter	5309	SDEIS	26(A), 28(A)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Serria Club, Mt. Evans Group	Yarrol	Lyn	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	5218	SDEIS	34
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	The Colorado Mountain Club	Neumann	Claude		Letter	5505	SDEIS	3(A), 5(E), 8(G), 12(D,E), 24(B), 26(A)
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Town of Empire	Short	Lori	Empire, CO	Personal Letter	5444	SDEIS	10(A), 11, 22
I. AGENCIES/ ORGANIZATIONS	Western Pacific Art Co.	Pugh	W.A		Comment Sheet	5221	SDEIS	28(N,F,A,U)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ambrust	William	Kittredge, CO	Comment Sheet	3	DEIS	2(A,C,E), 3(A,D), 4(E), 5(A,B,C,D), 9(E), 16(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Anderson	Clyde	Idaho Springs, CO	Comment Sheet	1	DEIS	2(A), 4(E), 9(C),
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		A.	Jorge		Personal Letter	5315	SDEIS	2(A,C), 3(A), 17
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Allen	Barbara	Georgetown, CO	Comment Sheet	140	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 5(C), 12(D,I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Allen	Barbara J.	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	5302	SDEIS	2(A), 3(A), 5(E,B,), 12(D), 24(A), 26(A), 28(B,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Allen	Barbara J.		Personal Letter	5770	SDEIS	3(A), 5(E), 12(D), 16(D), 24(A), 26(A), 28
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Allen	Christopher		Personal Letter	5768	SDEIS	3(A), 12(D), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ambrust	L.E.		Personal Letter	5243	SDEIS	3(A), 8, 28(F), 29(A,B), 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ambrust	L.E.		Personal Letter	5244	SDEIS	2(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ambrust	L.E.		Personal Letter	5288	SDEIS	2(A,C,E), 3(A,B), 8, 26, 29(A), 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ambrust	L.E.		Personal Letter	5289	SDEIS	2(A,C), 17
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ambrust	Lewis		Personal Letter	215	DEIS	2(B,C), 3(A,J), 8(E), 9(C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ambrust	William	Kittredge, CO	Comment Sheet	141	DEIS	2(C,D), 3(A,B), 8(B), 9(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Anderson	Bennett Boyd JR		Personal Letter	5769	SDEIS	2(A), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Anderson	Clyde R,	Idaho Springs, CO	Personal Letter	5237	SDEIS	2(A), 4(F), 8(B), 32

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Anderson	Coralue	Georgetown, CO	Comment Sheet	507	DEIS	1, 3(H), 16(C,D,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Anderson	Coralue	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	528	DEIS	1, 2(A,B,G), 3(A,D,H), 4(A,E), 5(A,B,E), 6(A,B), 7(B,D), 8(C), 9(B,E,G), 13(A), 15(B), 16(C,D,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Anderson	Coralue	Georgetown, CO	Comment Sheet	5253	SDEIS	2(B,C), 3(B), 4(F), 8(D,G), 12(A), 17, 29(C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Anderson	Coralue		Personal Letter	5501	SDEIS	4(E), 16(B,C,D), 23(F,R,P,L,S,Z)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Anderson	Coralue		Personal Letter	5767	SDEIS	2(B), 3(A), 12, 16(C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Anderson	Henry K Jr		Form Letter #3	5783	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Anderson	Hugh	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	5241	SDEIS	2(A), 23(L), 24(B), 26, 29, 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Anderson	Hugh	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #5	5273	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Anderson	Hugh	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	5294	SDEIS	2(A), 24(B), 26, 33, 35
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Anderson	Judy	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	213	DEIS	3(A), 7(A,D), 8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Anderson	Judy		Form Letter #5	5402	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Anderson	Wendy		Personal Letter	529	DEIS	2(B), 3(C,H), 4(A), 5(E), 12(A,E), 15(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Anderson	Wendy		Form Letter #5	5530	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Anderson	Wendy		Form Letter #6	5542	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Anderson	Wendy, Coralue, Kneisel, Henry		Form Letter #3	5520	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Andrew	Mel		Personal Letter	148	DEIS	1, 2(A,F), 3(H), 12(D,E,I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Andrews	Paul	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	230	DEIS	2(B,C), 8(D,G), 12(A,D,I), 16(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Andrews	Paul		Personal Letter	530	DEIS	2(A), 3(A), 8(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Andromidas	Jorge, L.	Boulder, CO	Personal Letter	214	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 3(A,I), 8(F), 12(E)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Angell	Elissa	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	531	DEIS	1, 2(A,C,D), 3(A), 4(A),5(B), 6(E), 8(D,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Angell	Elissa	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	5182	SDEIS	1, 23(U,W), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Angell	Elissa & Robert	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	5229	SDEIS	2(A,D), 24(B), 26(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		anonymous			Comment Sheet	23	DEIS	2(D), 8(G), 12(G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		anonymous			Comment Sheet	147	DEIS	2(D), 7(A), 12(D,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		anonymous			Comment Sheet	197	DEIS	10(A,B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		anonymous			Comment Sheet	506	DEIS	5(B), 12(D,G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Applegate	Sue		Form Letter #1	75	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Armstrong	David	Loveland, CO	Personal Letter	30	DEIS	2(E), 4(A), 8(E,G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Arnold	Matthew	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	31	DEIS	2(A,B,C,F,D), 3(A,J), 4(A), 7(A), 8(B,G) 12(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Arnold	Matt	Denver, CO	Form Letter #2	5383	SDEIS	8(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ashby	Lindsey		Form Letter #3	5526	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ashby	Lindsey and Rosa	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #5	5349	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Asphang	Rolf	Littleton, CO	Comment Sheet	198	DEIS	2(E,F), 3(A,D,J), 7(D), 12(E,H)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Augusto	Scott	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	532	DEIS	2(D), 12(A,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Axley	Hartman		Telephone Conversation Record	5753	SDEIS	23(F), 26, 35
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Axley	Marge		Telephone Conversation Record	5752	SDEIS	2(B), 23(F), 32, 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Babcock	Scott	Littleton, CO	Form Letter #1	76	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Baehley			Form Letter #3	5523	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 25, 28(F,H), 29(F)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Baer	Leslie	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	31	DEIS	2(A,B,C,F,D), 3(A,J), 4(A), 7(A), 8(B,G) 12(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Baer	Leslie Martel	Denver, CO	Form Letter #2	5384	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Baer	Robin	Lakewood, CO	Personal Letter	533	DEIS	2(B,C,D), 3(C,D), 12(D,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Baer	Robin		Personal Email	5361	SDEIS	3(A), 12(I), 24(B), 29(C), 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Baer	Robin M.		Personal Letter	5425	SDEIS	3(B), 24(B), 26, 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bailey	Charles	Hygiene, CO	Form Letter #2	5118	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Baker	Mary & Thomas		Form Letter #1	77	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Baldwin		Lakewood, CO	Personal Letter	5228	SDEIS	3(A), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Baleruy	Pam		Form Letter #1	78	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Balice	Judith		Personal Letter	5781	SDEIS	3(A), 12(D,G,H)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Balogh	David R.	Boone, CO	Personal Letter	534	DEIS	2(A,C), 8(E,G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Barbash	Noel		Personal E-Mail	517	DEIS	2(C), 4(A), 8(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Barker	Todd	Jericho, VT	Form Letter #1	79	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Barnes	Cynthia	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	216	DEIS	2(B), 3(A), 5(D), 8(F), 12(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Beauchamp	Gary and Deanna	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	149	DEIS	3(A), 4(A), 12(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Beauchamp	Gary and Deanna	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	150	DEIS	2(E), 3(E,J), 4(A), 8(C), 12(H)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Beauchamp	Gary and Deanna	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	151	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(B), 4(A), 12(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bectern	Rose		Form Letter #1	80	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bedford	Tamera		Personal Letter	5420	SDEIS	17, 23(C,AA), 24(B), 26, 28(F), 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Belknap	Russel L.	Lakewood, CO	Personal E-Mail	518	DEIS	1, 14(A)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bell	Amy	Buffalo, NY/Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #2	5336	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bell	Richard	Georgetown, CO	Comment Sheet	508	DEIS	4(C), 7(A), 9(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bellerson	Rebecca	Littleton, CO	Personal Letter	217	DEIS	11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bennent	Steve & Maureen	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	218	DEIS	2(D), 5(A,B,C,E), 8(E,F,G), 9(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bennett	Maurn		Form Letter #5	5398	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bennett	Steve	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	5291	SDEIS	12(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bennett	Steve and Maureen		Personal Letter	5433	SDEIS	2(A,D), 8, 9(B), 17, 23(F,J)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Benshoft	Pat	Bailey, CO	Comment Sheet	5199	SDEIS	24(B), 30(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bente	James	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	32	DEIS	2(B), 3(B), 4(E), 8(D), 9(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bente	James W.	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	5295	SDEIS	2(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Berteau	Paul S.		Personal Letter	535	DEIS	2(D), 3(J), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bertolli	Rita	Lakewood, CO	Personal Letter	33	DEIS	1, 2(A,B,C), 3(G), 9(C), 12(D,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bitner	Kelly	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	219	DEIS	2(A), 4(D), 7(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Blau	George	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	220	DEIS	3(J), 12(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Blau	Reiwen		Personal Letter	221	DEIS	12(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bleesz-Young	Mary Pat	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	5209	SDEIS	10(C), 11, 22
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Boak/Keller	Sean/Linda	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	536	DEIS	12(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bode	Alletta	Bailey, CO	Comment Sheet	5201	SDEIS	3(A), 17, 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bohing	Millard & Helen		Form Letter #1	81	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bolan	William, T.	Aurora, CO	Personal Letter	222	DEIS	10(A), 11

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Boll	Janis	Georgetown, CO	Comment Sheet	4	DEIS	10(B), 12(A,D), 15(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Borneman	Walter, R.	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	223	DEIS	2(A,D), 3(H,I), 12(A,D,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Borneman	Walter, R.	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	702	DEIS	2(A,D), 3(H,I), 12(A,D,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bostick	Neely H.		Personal Letter	5474	SDEIS	12(D), 16(D), 28(D,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Boucke	Laurie	Lafayette, CO	Personal Letter	537	DEIS	7(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bowen	Daniel C.	Denver, CO	Form Letter #2	5126	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bradford	Charles		Personal Letter	5418	SDEIS	23(C), 24(A,B), 26, 33, 35
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Bradley	Melissa	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	538	DEIS	3(A), 4(A), 8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Braub	Sharon		Form Letter #1	82	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Brauch	Sharon	Westminster, CO	Form Letter #4	5277	SDEIS	2(A), 4(F), 5(C), 16, 28(F,H), 29
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Brenneman	Janet		Form Letter #5	5403	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Breuer	Lawrence	Denver, CO	Form Letter #2	5385	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Brinkman	Jackie	Denver, CO	Form Letter #2	5119	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Broadhurst	Janet and Henry P.		Personal Letter	5760	SDEIS	12(A), 24(B), 29(A,C), 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Brooks	Koleen		Personal Letter	5488	SDEIS	3(B), 12(G), 16(C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Broussard	Bennett		Personal Letter	5427	SDEIS	3(A), 26(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Brown	Byron & Carol	LaBarge, WY	Personal Letter	224	DEIS	11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Brown	Roz		Personal Email	5362	SDEIS	3(A), 12(I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Brune	Renee	Golden, CO	Comment Sheet	199	DEIS	2(A,B,C,D), 3(D), 8(B,C,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Buckland	Phil	Empire, CO	Comment Sheet	5	DEIS	1, 5(C), 14(A)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Buckland	Phil		Personal Letter	5450	SDEIS	10(A), 11(C), 22
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Buckland	Sally Guanella	Empire, CO	Comment Sheet	6	DEIS	11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Buckland	Sally Guanella	Empire, CO	Personal Letter	539	DEIS	10(A,B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Buckland	Sally Guanella		Personal Letter	5446	SDEIS	11, 22
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Buckley	Karel	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	225	DEIS	2(B,D,E), 3(I), 4(A), 5(A,B,E), 8(G), 9(C), 12(E,I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Budny	Scott	Conifer, CO	Personal Letter	226	DEIS	11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Budny	Scott	Conifer, CO	Personal Letter	5285	SDEIS	10(A,B), 18, 26(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Burdich	Joan		Form Letter #1	83	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Burk	Mr. and Mrs. Gerald D	Bailey, CO	Comment Sheet	509	DEIS	3(E), 7(A), 8(G), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Burnap	Parry W.		Personal Letter	5417	SDEIS	24(A,B), 26, 33, 35
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Burrows	Richard W.		Comment Sheet	510	DEIS	2(D), 4(E), 12(A,B,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Calhoun	John	Silver Plume, CO	Personal Letter	540	DEIS	1, 2(F), 4(A,E), 6(A,D), 8(G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Calhoun	John	Silver Plume, CO	Personal Letter	703	DEIS	1, 2(F), 4(A,E), 6(A,D), 8(G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Callison	Anne W.	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	152	DEIS	1, 3(E), 3(B,J), 8(A,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Callison	Anne W.		Personal Letter	5426	SDEIS	2(A), 3(A), 8(G), 17
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Campbell	Carolyn L.		Form Letter #1	253	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		CampCrow			Personal E-Mail	24	DEIS	2(A,B,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Campo	Mike	Boulder, CO	Personal Letter	541	DEIS	8(E), 12(A,D,E,I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Capps	Wes and Carol		Form Letter #3	5524	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Capps	Wes and Carol		Form Letter #5	5541	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Capps	Wes and Carol		Form Letter #5	5756	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Capps	Wes and Carol		Form Letter #5	5790	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Capps	Wes and Carol		Form Letter #5	5791	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Carberry	Eva		Personal Email	5808	SDEIS	10(A,B), 11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Carman	Betty	San Francisco, CA	Personal Letter	35	DEIS	2(E), 8(C), 9(C), 12(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Carman	Betty Criley	San Francisco, CA	Personal Letter	5233	SDEIS	2(D), 5(E), 12(D), 26(A), 28(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Carman	Betty Criley	Georgetown, CO/San Francisco, CA	Form Letter #2	5257	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Carmen	Betty Criley		Form Letter #5	5806	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Carpenter	James R.	Zionsville	Personal Letter	5193	SDEIS	3(A), 17, 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Carpenter	Jim and Nancy	Zionsville, IN	Personal Letter	153	DEIS	2(B,C), 8(B,C,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Carpenter	Nancy	Zionsville	Personal Letter	5194	SDEIS	2(A), 3(B), 17, 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Carper	Robert L. and Carol Joy		Personal Letter	5481	SDEIS	2(D), 3(B), 8(G), 12(D), 29(A), 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Cassella	John	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	5367	SDEIS	8
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Chamberlain	Robert M.		Personal Letter	5410	SDEIS	3(A), 8(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Chambers	Roberta	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	5371	SDEIS	2(C), 3(A), 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Chandler	Polly		Personal Letter	542	DEIS	3(D), 4(A), 5(E), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Chandler	Polly		Personal Letter	5780	SDEIS	8, 16(C), 23(Z), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Chastain	Andrew	Norcross, CO	Personal Letter	5188	SDEIS	3(A), 16(C), 17
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Christianmen	Chas		Personal Letter	5423	SDEIS	2(C), 16(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Church	Kasey	Grant, CO	Comment Sheet	5200	SDEIS	4(E), 17, 26, 28(A,F)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ciancaglini	Alex	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	227	DEIS	1, 2(D), 7(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Clark	Mary Riddle		Form Letter #2	5512	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Clark	Rich	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	5286	SDEIS	10(A,B,C), 11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Clifford	Clara		Personal Letter	5359	SDEIS	2(A,D), 12(I) , 16C, 28(B,G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Clifford	Clara J.		Form Letter #5	5792	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Clifford	Clara, J.	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	228	DEIS	2(B,C), 8(E), 12(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Coletti	Ann Trelease		Form Letter #5	5800	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Coletti	Ann Trelease		Form Letter #5	5805	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Conley	Paula		Personal Letter	5412	SDEIS	2(A,C), 3(A), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Conley	Paula		Personal Letter	5413	SDEIS	23(C,D,P), 28, 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Conley	Paula		Personal Letter	5771	SDEIS	12(D), 16(C,D), 23(P), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Connolly	Gregory, M.	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	229	DEIS	2(A,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Connor	Paula	Morrison, CO	Personal Letter	543	DEIS	2(B,C,E), 3(B,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Conway	Kathleen		Personal Letter	5763	SDEIS	17
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Cordova			Form Letter #1	84	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Corkern	Trey	Grant, CO	Personal Letter	36	DEIS	2(A,D,E), 3(A,B,E,F), 4(A,E), 15(C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		CT and Coletti	Rob and Anne Trelease	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #2	5254	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Cunningham	Kirk	Boulder, CO	Personal Letter	230	DEIS	2(B,C), 8(D,G), 12(A,D,I), 16(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Curran	Carol		Form Letter #2	5511	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Dafary	Dennis M.		Personal Letter	5454	SDEIS	8(G), 12(D)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Daley	Andy	Ridgeway , CO	Personal Letter	5187	SDEIS	8(G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Dallas	Sandra	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	37	DEIS	1, 2(A,D), 3(B,E), 4(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Dallas	Sandra		Form Letter #5	5406	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Dallas	Sandra		Form Letter #5	5528	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Damoc	Chester, J.	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	231	DEIS	11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Davia	David and Deborah		Personal Letter	5502	SDEIS	2(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Davidson	Mary Ellen		Personal Letter	5303	SDEIS	2(A),12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Davis	Carolyn	Bloomington, IN	Form Letter #2	5328	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Davis	Jerry	Fairplay, CO	Comment Sheet	200	DEIS	10(A), 11, 18
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Davis	Jerry	Fairplay, CO	Personal Letter	5214	SDEIS	17, 28(F,G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Davis	Susan		Form Letter #2	5389	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Day	Peggy		Form Letter #1	85	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		De Lange	CJ	Bailey, CO	Personal Letter	5282	SDEIS	10(B), 11, 22(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Dean	Karen		Personal Letter	5761	SDEIS	17, 23(L), 24(B), 26, 33, 35
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Dean	Karen L.		Form Letter #2	5395	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Dean	Karen, L.	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	232	DEIS	3(A,D,J), 12(I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		DeCola	Julie		Personal Letter	544	DEIS	4(A), 12(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Delange	Betty	Lakewood, CO	Personal Letter	545	DEIS	3(D,H)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Dennily	Owen		Form Letter #2	5516	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Dennily	Owen		Form Letter #6	5546	SDEIS	3(A), 24(B), 26, 33

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Deszcz-Pan	Maria	Lakewood, CO	Personal Letter	546	DEIS	12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Diblan	Tiffany	Bailey, CO	Comment Sheet	5210	SDEIS	17, 28(A,F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Divis	Pat	Bailey, CO	Comment Sheet	7	DEIS	3(B), 12(A,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Domely	Owen		Form Letter #5	5794	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Dorsey	Vivian D		Form Letter #1	254	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Dugan	Megan	Grant, CO	Comment Sheet	201	DEIS	4(A), 8(B,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Dugan	Megan		Personal Letter	5460	SDEIS	2(C), 3(A), 8(D), 16(C,D,E), 17, 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Dugan	Scott	Grant, CO	Comment Sheet	202	DEIS	2(D), 3(A), 8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Dugan	Scott		Personal Letter	5459	SDEIS	2(A,C), 5(E), 23(D,L,O), 24(A), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Dunn	Earnest		Personal Letter	5204	SDEIS	17
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Dworkin	Manny and Sally	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	155	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 3(B,J), 8(A,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Dyer	Jennifer		Form Letter #1	86	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Dyer	Jennifer	Denver, CO	Form Letter #4	5379	SDEIS	2(A), 4(F), 5(C), 16, 28(F,H), 29
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Dyer	Jennifer	Denver, CO	Form Letter #4	5396	SDEIS	2(A), 4(F), 5(C), 16, 28(F,H), 29
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Eckard	Roberta and Henry		Form Letter #5	5401	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Eckels	Nini		Personal Letter	5408	SDEIS	10(A), 11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Edwards	Laura		Form Letter #1	87	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Eisenman	Thomas R.	Bailey, CO	Comment Sheet	5198	SDEIS	12(D,I), 17, 29(D), 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Elliott	Robert B.	Lakewood, CO	Personal Letter	5239	SDEIS	2(D), 3(A), 12(D), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Elliott	Thomas S.		Personal Letter	5437	SDEIS	2(A), 3(A), 8(D), 12(D), 24(B), 28(B,H)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ells	Sharon	Lakewood, CO	Personal Letter	547	DEIS	2(A,D), 3(A), 5(E), 7(A), 8(C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Emanuel	Carolyn		Personal Letter	5248	SDEIS	26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Emerson	Julie	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	5238	SDEIS	3(A), 16(B,C,D), 23(Q), 28(D,F), 29(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Esson	Anne, L.	Vail, CO	Personal Letter	234	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 5(A), 8(B), 9(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Fabyanic	Jerry	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	38	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A,E,H,J), 8(A,D), 9(F), 12(A,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Fabyanic	Jerry		Personal Letter	5482	SDEIS	8(D), 9(C), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Fallat	Ann Gray	Santa Ana, CA	Personal Letter	704	DEIS	3(I,J), 12(H,I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Fallet	Ann Grey	Santa Anna, CA	Personal Letter	548	DEIS	2(E), 3(J), 12(I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Farny	Dave	Telluride, CO	Personal Letter	39	DEIS	8(E), 9(B,C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Farrow	Anne, C.	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	235	DEIS	2(C), 5(A), 8(B), 12(A,D,E), 14(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Fawcett	James	Littleton, CO	Personal Letter	236	DEIS	10(A), 11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Feikin	Daniel	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	40	DEIS	2(A,D), 3(A), 8(E), 12(A,D,E,I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Fennessey	Shirley	Pine, CO	Form Letter #2	5129	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Figley	Betty	Empire, CO	Personal Letter	237	DEIS	7(A), 12(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Finney	Terri	Denver, CO	Form Letter #2	5117	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Fintus	Lila		Form Letter #2	5394	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Fitzpatrick	Yvonne M.	Lakewood, CO	Form Letter #2	5122	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ford	Gregory		Personal Letter	5360	SDEIS	10(A), 11, 22
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ford	Rob		Form Letter #1	627	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Fox	Allen & Katie	Morrison, CO	Personal Letter	549	DEIS	8(E), 9(C)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Fox	Kate and Alan	Morrison, CO	Form Letter #2	5127	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Fox	Micheal	Lakewood, CO	Comment Sheet	511	DEIS	3(E), 8(G), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Fox	Susan	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	550	DEIS	8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Fraley	Pattie		Form Letter #3	5264	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Fraley	Pattie	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #5	5269	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Fraser	Margaret		Personal Letter	5324	SDEIS	8(G), 26, 35
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Frasier	Bill and Gail	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	5356	SDEIS	2(D), 8(G), 9(C), 28(F), 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gant	Donovan L.		Personal Letter	551	DEIS	2(D), 4(A), 8(2), 12(I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gardner	Mr. And Mrs. Ronald E.	Morrison, CO	Personal Letter	552	DEIS	11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Georinger	Ruben		Personal Letter	5779	SDEIS	16(C),17,23(R),26,28(B,H)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gidlow	Lilla		Personal Letter	5428	SDEIS	3(A), 5(E), 12(A), 23(C,F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gilbert	Linda		Form Letter #1	88	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gilmore	Mary A.	Empire, CO/Denver, CO	Personal Letter	553	DEIS	8(G), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ginley	Roberta	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	238	DEIS	2(B,C,D), 5(A,B), 8(G), 16(A,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ginley	Roberta		Personal Letter	5476	SDEIS	2(A,D), 3(A), 23(S), 26, 28(E), 29(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Glaser	Rose		Personal Letter	5493	SDEIS	10(A), 11(C), 22
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Goeringer	Rube	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	894	DEIS	1, 2(B,C,D), 5(B,E), 8(E), 9(C,E), 13(A,B), 15(A,B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Goeringer	Ruben		Personal Letter	5755	SDEIS	2(A,D), 5(E), 9(B,E), 12(G), 16(B,C), 28, 32
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Goldstein	Nathan	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	42	DEIS	8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gordon	Bill	Fairplay, CO	Comment Sheet	8	DEIS	1, 2(C)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gordon	Bill		Comment Sheet	5197	SDEIS	3(B), 28(A,F), 29(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gordon	James R.		Personal Letter	5225	SDEIS	2(A), 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gordon	Jim		Personal Letter	5217	SDEIS	2(A), 23(S,O,N,K,E), 24(B), 28(A,F,G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gordon	Jim	Grant, CO	Personal Letter	5234	SDEIS	4(E), 24(B), 32
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gordon	Jim	Grant, CO	Personal Letter	5235	SDEIS	5(E), 28(A), 29
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gordon	Jim	Grant, CO	Personal Letter	554	DEIS	1, 6(A), 15(B,D), 16(A,B,C,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gordon	Jim	Grant, CO	Personal Letter	555	DEIS	3(A), 5(A,B,E), 6(A,B), 9(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gordon	Jim	Grant, CO	Personal Letter	556	DEIS	1, 4(E), 6(A,B,C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gordon	Jim	Grant, CO	Personal Letter	557	DEIS	1
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gordon	Jim	Grant, CO	Personal Letter	558	DEIS	1, 2(B), 4(E), 6(A,B,D,E), 8(C,G), 16(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gordon	Jim	Grant, CO	Personal Letter	559	DEIS	6(A), 9(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gordon	Jim		Personal Letter	560	DEIS	1, 4(A,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gordon	Jim		Personal Letter	561	DEIS	1, 3(F), 5(B), 9(D), 15(C,D), 16(C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gordon	Kevin and Whitney	Indiana IN	Personal Letter	5185	SDEIS	1, 2(A), 17, 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gordon	Mary		Personal Letter	43	DEIS	3(A,F,J), 5(C), 8(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gordon	Rob	Grant, CO	Comment Sheet	142	DEIS	1, 2(A), 3(D,F), 4(A,E), 5(A,C,E), 8(F,G), 9(B,E,F,G), 12(D), 15(B,D), 16(C,D,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gottschalk	Elizabeth		Form Letter #1	89	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gottschalk	Libbie	Littleton, CO	Form Letter #4	5279	SDEIS	2(A), 4(F), 5(C), 16, 28(F,H), 29
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gottschalk	Libbie	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #5	5353	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gottschalk	Libbie	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #5	5387	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gottschalk	Libbie	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #5	5397	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gottschalk	N.J.		Personal E-Mail	25	DEIS	2(E), 3(A,B,J), 8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gottshalk	Libbie	Littleton & Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	5223	SDEIS	3(B), 17, 23(A,J,F,U,T)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gottshalk			Form Letter #1	174	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,J), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gottshalk			Form Letter #1	175	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Graham	Geoffrey	Lisle, IL	Personal Letter	239	DEIS	2(A), 3(A,J), 5(E), 7(E), 16(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Graham	Geoffry		Form Letter #2	5381	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Graham			Form Letter #1	90	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Grebe	Don A.	Lakewood, CO	Comment Sheet	9	DEIS	7(B,G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Grebe	Kathleen	Lakewood, CO	Comment Sheet	10	DEIS	2(A), 3(B), 12(A,D), 15(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Guanella	Glenda M.		Personal Letter	5452	SDEIS	11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gulley	J.L and Jean	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #5	5272	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gulley	Mr & Mrs James	Tyler	Personal Letter	5240	SDEIS	3(A,B), 12(D), 28(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gulley	Mr & Mrs James L.	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	44	DEIS	2(A,B,E), 9(B,C), 12(E,I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gustafson	Jeffry, A.	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	240	DEIS	2(A,C,E,F,G), 3(B,J), 5(B), 8(A,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Gusteiman	Kate	Georgetown, CO/ Santa Fe, NM	Form Letter #2	5262	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Guyenn	Peter C. and Caroline C.	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	562	DEIS	2(A,B), 3(A), 4(A), 5(B), 9(B), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hadley/Shanley	Barbara M./Phillip R.	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	241	DEIS	4(A), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hamilton	Laurie		Personal Letter	157	DEIS	2(B), 8(G), 12(E)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hamilton	Laurie		Personal Letter	5473	SDEIS	2(A), 8(G), 12(G), 28(E), 29(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Harper	Triena Merydith	Indian Hills, CO	Personal Letter	563	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 4(A), 5(E), 9(C), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Harris	Melone and Carl		Personal Letter	5492	SDEIS	2(A), 3(B), 4(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hartong	Bill & Elaine	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	242	DEIS	2(C,E), 3(J), 5(B), 7(A,G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hartong	E. Elaine & Ted	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #2	5256	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Harvey	Edward W.	Grant, CO	Personal Letter	45	DEIS	2(A,D), 3(A,F), 5(A,C),8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Harvey	Edward W.	Grant, CO	Personal Letter	705	DEIS	2(A,D), 3(A,F), 5(A,C), 8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Haskell	Kirk		Form Letter #2	5513	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Haskell	Kirk		Form Letter #6	5543	SDEIS	3(A), 24(B), 26, 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hatch	Dorothy	Conifer, CO	Personal Letter	243	DEIS	2(C), 3(A), 12(A,E,I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hatcher	David H.		Personal Letter	5506	SDEIS	8(G),12(I), 24(A), 28(E), 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hauser	Ken W.	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	244	DEIS	1, 2(B,C,D), 3(A,H), 4(D), 5(A), 7(A,E), 12(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hawkins	Kate	Georgetown, CO/Cedar Rapids, CO/LA	Personal Letter	564	DEIS	3(B,D), 5(E), 8(G), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hawkins	Kate	Georgetown, CO/Cedar Rapids, IA	Form Letter #2	5334	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hawkins	Kate		Form Letter #5	5803	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hector	Louise	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	565	DEIS	8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hegg	Heather		Form Letter #2	5391	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Helmstetter	Paul	Littleton, CO	Personal Letter	566	DEIS	3(A), 7(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Henderson	Donita H.	Northport, AL	Personal Letter	245	DEIS	2(D,E), 3(A), 15(A)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Henning	William	Littleton, CO	Comment Sheet	143	DEIS	8(B,E,G), 9(C), 12(G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Henning	William	Highlands Ranch, CO	Personal Email	5251	SDEIS	8(G), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Henning	William A.	Highlands Ranch, CO	Personal Letter	5232	SDEIS	8(G), 12(H)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hershberger	Ruth	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	246	DEIS	2(C), 8(E), 9(C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hershberger	Ruth	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	5317	SDEIS	2(A), 12(A), 26(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Heyse	Don	Fort Collins, CO	Personal E-Mail	519	DEIS	2(A,E,F), 3(A,H,J), 5(A,E), 7(A), 8(E,F), 9(F), 12(I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Heyse	Don		Personal Letter	5466	SDEIS	2(A,B,E), 5(E), 7(G), 8(C,G), 9, 16(D), 17, 23, 24(A), 25, 26(A), 29(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hickon	Gail	Denver, CO	Form Letter #2	5331	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Higgins	Sally M.	Pine, CO	Personal Letter	5373	SDEIS	2(A,B,D), 3(A), 5(E,B), 17, 24(B), 26(A), 28(A,F,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hisgen	Harv	Golden, CO	Personal E-Mail	520	DEIS	14(A,C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hodges	Alice		Personal Letter	5762	SDEIS	8(G), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Holmes	Julie		Personal Letter	5453	SDEIS	10(A), 11, 26(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hopkins	Wilson	Denver, CO	Comment Sheet	144	DEIS	1, 2(B), 3(A,D), 5(A), 8(B,F), 9(A,G), 15(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hopkins	Wilson	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	158	DEIS	1, 3(C), 4(A), 8(D), 9(C), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hopkins	Wilson B.	Grant, CO	Personal Letter	5323	SDEIS	2(D), 28(L)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Horwitz	Lawrence	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	247	DEIS	11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Howell	Jan	Idaho Springs, CO	Comment Sheet	11	DEIS	3(A,B,D), 4(A,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Howell	Jan and M. Sue		Personal Letter	5416	SDEIS	5(E), 17, 24(A,B), 26(A), 28(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Huber	Patrick	Florissant, CO	Personal Letter	159	DEIS	2(C,D,E), 3(A,J), 4(A), 7(A,D,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Huestis	Robert	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	567	DEIS	1, 2(B,C,D), 3(H)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hughes	K.A.	Indianapolis, IN	Personal E-Mail	26	DEIS	2(A,D), 3(J), 8(E), 12(H)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hughes	Ralph M. & Mary Sue	Muncie, IN	Personal Letter	248	DEIS	2(B), 8(B,D,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hugo	Richard	Aurora, CO	Personal Email	5249	SDEIS	2(A,B,C,E), 3(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hume	Amy & Chad	Golden, CO	Personal Letter	5292	SDEIS	8(B,G), 17, 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hume	Dorothy		Personal Letter	5507	SDEIS	8, 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hume	Scot	Colorado Springs, CO	Personal Letter	46	DEIS	4(D), 12(D,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hume	Scot W.	Colorado Springs, CO	Personal Letter	5307	SDEIS	12(A), 26(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hun	Kimberly		Form Letter #1	91	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hunninen	Katherine	Silver Plume, CO	Personal Letter	568	DEIS	1, 2(A,B,C,F), 3(C,D,H), 4(A,B,E), 5(B), 6(A,B,C,D), 7(D), 9(B), 15(B), 16(C,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Hunt	Robert V.	Littleton, CO	Personal Letter	569	DEIS	2(E), 8(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Huston	Ron	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	570	DEIS	2(B,C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ikler	Bill	Nederland, CO	Personal Letter	249	DEIS	2(A,E,D), 4(C), 7(A,B,D), 8(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ikler	Bill		Personal Letter	5478	SDEIS	2(A), 7(G), 16(D), 24(A), 26(A), 28(A,E,F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Illig	Janice	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	250	DEIS	2(B,C,D), 3(A,J), 8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Illig	Janice	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	5310	SDEIS	2(A), 8(G), 12(A), 26(A), 29
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Imse	Ann	Morrison, CO	Personal Letter	571	DEIS	2(A,D), 3(A), 9(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Isenhardt	Myra Warren & Frank	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	251	DEIS	2(A,D,E), 3(A,J), 4(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Jackson	David F.	Littleton, CO	Personal Letter	5281	SDEIS	10(B), 11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Jackson	David F. & Kathleen S.	Littleton, CO	Personal Letter	572	DEIS	10(A,B), 11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Jacoby	Charles	Westminster, CO	Comment Sheet	5195	SDEIS	2(A), 26

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		James	Lynda	Fairplay, CO	Comment Sheet	145	DEIS	1, 4(A), 13(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		James	Lynda		Personal Letter	5479	SDEIS	3(A), 5(E), 12(G), 16(B,C), 17, 24(A,B), 28(D,E), 29(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Jarboe	JoLynn		Personal E-Mail	27	DEIS	2(A,C), 3(B), 7(A,G), 8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Jarvis	James R.	Kansas City	Personal Letter	5290	SDEIS	26, 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Jausler	John		Personal Letter	5441	SDEIS	26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Jay	Kathryn		Form Letter #1	92	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Jeglum	Glenn	Kittredge, CO	Personal Letter	573	DEIS	2(D), 3(A,B), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Jenkins	Howard	Littleton, CO	Personal Email	5293	SDEIS	2(B,C), 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Jenkins	Susan Worth	Littleton, CO	Personal Letter	252	DEIS	1, 2(A,B,C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Jenkins	Susan Worth	Littleton, CO	Personal Email	5252	SDEIS	2(B,C), 3(A), 12(G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Jensen	Einar N.	Idaho Springs, CO	Personal Letter	449	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 3(H,G), 5(D,E), 9(B), 12(A,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Jensen	M.E.	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	450	DEIS	2(A,D), 3(C,G,J), 15(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Johnson	Jane Murphy		Form Letter #1	255	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Johnson	Michael	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	574	DEIS	2(A), 12(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Jones	Pat and Eldora		Personal Letter	5504	SDEIS	2(E), 3(A), 8(D), 35
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Jones	Susan	Boulder, CO	Personal Letter	160	DEIS	2(A,B,C,E), 8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Jorgensen	Dorothy		Form Letter #5	5534	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Joseph	Mark	Mt. Vernon, WA	Form Letter #2	5128	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Juliana			Form Letter #1	93	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Kaderet	Jeff		Personal Letter	5440	SDEIS	12(D), 26

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Kallman	Lisa	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	5186	SDEIS	3(A), 12(I) , 24(B), 29
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Kaylor	Joy		Personal Letter	451	DEIS	8(1), 19(2)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Keiser	Col. (Ret.) C.P.	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	161	DEIS	2(B,C,D), 3(A,D,I), 12(I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Keller	Linda	Denver, CO	Comment Sheet	5203	SDEIS	17, 26, 29
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Kelley	Kerin		Form Letter #5	5536	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Kelson	Betsy		Personal Letter	575	DEIS	3(J), 7(A,B,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Kelson	Bitsy		Telephone Conversation Record	5495	SDEIS	3(A), 8(G), 24(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Kemper	William	Denver, CO	Comment Sheet	12	DEIS	2(A,C), 4C, 5(A,B), 7(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Kenry	George	Littleton, CO	Personal Letter	576	DEIS	8(E), 9(B,F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Kester	George D.	Crete	Personal Letter	5374	SDEIS	26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Kester	Robert C.		Personal Letter	5480	SDEIS	2(E), 3(B), 8(G), 26, 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Kilgallion	Barbara		Personal Letter	5778	SDEIS	8(G,H)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Klever	John H M		Personal E-Mail	521	DEIS	10(A,B), 11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Knox	Kimberly		Form Letter #2	5515	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Knox	Kimberly		Form Letter #6	5545	SDEIS	3(A), 24(B), 26, 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Knox	Kimberly		Form Letter #5	5795	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Koehler	Suzanne		Form Letter #2	5393	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Kornelson	Mac & Jennie	Aurora, CO	Personal Letter	577	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 3(A), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Kramer	David	Evergreen, CO	Comment Sheet	512	DEIS	2, 3(A), 12(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Krause	Kathryn		Personal Letter	5442	SDEIS	8

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Kreider	Jack	Greenwood Village, CO	Form Letter #2	5121	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Krieger	Abba	Carbondale, CO	Personal Letter	452	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 3(A), 12(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Krueger	John		Form Letter #5	5539	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Krueger	John		Form Letter #6	5547	SDEIS	3(A), 24(B), 26, 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Kruger	Frances		Form Letter #1	94	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Kruger	Frances A.	Golden, CO	Form Letter #4	5275	SDEIS	2(A), 4(F), 5(C), 16, 28(F,H), 29
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Kruger	Lois and Brent		Personal Letter	5487	SDEIS	2(A), 3(A), 5(F), 16(C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Kuehn	Kathleen	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	453	DEIS	2(C), 3(C,D), 7(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Kurath	John and Stacey	Arvada/Jefferson, CO	Personal Letter	454	DEIS	2(A,B), 8(B), 9(C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Lamb	Shaman L	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #5	5268	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Lambert	Edmund G. and Carol Lee		Personal Letter	5490	SDEIS	2(E,B), 3(A), 8(D), 12(D), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Lamping	Jim		Personal Letter	5447	SDEIS	4(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Lamping	Jim		Personal Letter	5448	SDEIS	3(B), 10(A,B,C), 11(C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Lamping	Jim	Grant, CO	Personal Letter	5208	SDEIS	11, 29(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Landberg	Ronald J.	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #2	5260	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Landberg	Ronald J.		Form Letter #5	5804	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Landberg	Sandra L.	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #2	5259	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Landberg	Sandra L.	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #5	5350	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Lankford	Polly	Georgetown, CO	Comment Sheet	13	DEIS	7(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Lankford	Polly	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #5	5352	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Larrick	Louise Gottschalk	Englewood, CO	Personal Letter	455	DEIS	2(D), 3(A,D), 8(G), 12(D,I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Lee	Patricia		Personal Email	5377	SDEIS	2(D), 8(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Lehrer	Charles	Loveland, CO	Personal Letter	163	DEIS	2(B,E), 3(A,D), 4(A,B), 8(C), 9(C), 12(I), 13(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Lehrer	Charles "Bud"		Personal Letter	5469	SDEIS	4(E), 12(D), 16(D,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Lembitz	Deanne	Loveland, CO	Personal Letter	5306	SDEIS	2(A), 3(A), 12(D), 16C, 26(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Levin	Mark	Idaho Springs, CO	Comment Sheet	513	DEIS	1
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Levy	Mimi	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	579	DEIS	10(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Lewis	Margaret		Personal Letter	5439	SDEIS	3(A), 9(C), 24(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Leyendecker	Liston E. and Barbara B.		Personal Letter	5424	SDEIS	3(A), 8(G), 23(C,P,T), 28(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Lincoln	Daniel B.	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	5354	SDEIS	2(D), 8(G), 9(C), 24(B), 28(A,F), 29(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Lupe	John		Form Letter #1	628	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Luther	Beth A.	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	5286	SDEIS	10(A,B,C), 11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Lutz	Katherine M.	Denver, CO	Comment Sheet	514	DEIS	2(A,B,D), 12(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Mainquish	Linda		Form Letter #1	95	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Malk	Diane	Denver, CO	Form Letter #2	5125	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Mann	Kathryn & Timothy	Arvada, CO	Personal Letter	456	DEIS	3(A,G), 4(A), 7(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Markovitz	Laurie	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	164	DEIS	2(A,C,D), 3(A,D,J), 4(A), 12(D,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Markowitz	Laurie		Form Letter #5	5404	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Marrell	Kristi and Family		Form Letter #5	5535	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Marsh	Tracey	Grant, CO	Comment Sheet	14	DEIS	2(A,B,C,E), 3(A,B)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Master	Jane L.		Form Letter #2	5765	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Mathowitz	Joanne Holden	Georgetown, CO	Comment Sheet	15	DEIS	10(A), 19(2), 20(20)(1)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Mc Daniel		Pine, CO	Comment Sheet	16	DEIS	11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Mc Nabb	Kerry	Aurora, CO	Personal Letter	580	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 5(B), 8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Mc Nair	Don		Comment Sheet	203	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 3(A), 12(I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		McCann	James D	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	5286	SDEIS	10(A,B,C), 11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		McHugh	Kerry Ann		Comment Sheet	5500	SDEIS	9(C), 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		McKinney	Jan		Personal Letter	5456	SDEIS	2(D), 3(A), 5(E), 8, 29(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		McLaren	Brian		Form Letter #1	96	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		McLaren	Brian	Denver, CO	Form Letter #4	5278	SDEIS	2(A), 4(F), 5(C), 16, 28(F,H), 29
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		McMeekin	Dorothy	Chanata	Personal Letter	5224	SDEIS	3(A), 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		McMeekin	Dorothy & John		Personal Letter	457	DEIS	12(E,I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		McNair	Donald W.	Empire, CO	Personal Letter	5246	SDEIS	33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		McNiel	M.		Form Letter #3	5784	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		McNiel	M.		Form Letter #2	5514	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		McNiel	M.		Form Letter #6	5544	SDEIS	3(A), 24(B), 26, 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Meeks	Mark	Bailey, CO	Personal Letter	581	DEIS	2(B,D), 3(H), 7(D), 12(I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Meeks	Mark	Bailey, CO	Personal Letter	5192	SDEIS	3(A), 28(A,F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Mekse	Penelope		Form Letter #1	97	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Menze	Sue		Personal Letter	5368	SDEIS	2(A), 8

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Meo	Annie	Denver, CO	Personal Email	5205	SDEIS	22
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Merrill	M. Stanely		Personal Letter	5414	SDEIS	2(A), 3(G), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Merrill	M. Stanley		Personal Letter	5776	SDEIS	2(A), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Metz	Diane M.	Greenwood Village, CO	Form Letter #2	5120	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Meyer	Eric R.	Boulder, CO	Personal Letter	582	DEIS	2(A,D,F), 3(D,J), 12(A,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Meyer	Paul A. & Linda K.	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	583	DEIS	11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Milland	Steph C.		Personal Letter	5407	SDEIS	10(A,B), 11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Miller	Ardis	Denver, CO	Form Letter #2	5382	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Minick	Virginia	Golden, CO	Personal Letter	5242	SDEIS	2(A), 3(G), 5(E), 12(D), 24(A), 26, 28(D), 29(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Minick	Virginia C.	Golden, CO	Personal Letter	458	DEIS	2(C,D,H), 3(A,I), 4(A), 5(A,D,E), 12(I), 16(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Mishler	Laura	Colorado Springs, CO	Personal Letter	165	DEIS	1, 2(A,B,C,E), 3(J), 5(B,E), 15(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Mishler	Robert	Monument, CO	Personal Letter	52	DEIS	2(A,C), 8(E), 9(G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Mollenauer	Paul	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	5236	SDEIS	2(D), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Moller	Anne S.		Personal Letter	5431	SDEIS	2(D), 3(A), 12(A), 23(S), 26(A), 29(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Moore	Janice & Mike	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	584	DEIS	3(D,H), 12(E,I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Moore	Janice and Michael		Form Letter #5	5405	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Moore	Michael		Personal Letter	5777	SDEIS	3(A,B), 16C, 23(Z), 29(A,B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Morris	Estel & Lucille		Form Letter #1	98	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Morton	Elizabeth	Lakewood, CO	Personal Letter	5312	SDEIS	8(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Mott	Marcha	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	459	DEIS	2(B,C), 3(A), 4(A), 7(D), 8(G)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Mott	Martha		Personal Letter	5245	SDEIS	24(B), 29
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Mueller	Lavonne	DeKalb, IL	Personal Letter	460	DEIS	3(J), 7(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Mueller	Linda	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	53	DEIS	1, 2(B,C), 3(A,C,D,J), 7(A), 8(B), 12(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Mueller	Mike	Littleton, CO	Personal Letter	585	DEIS	2(A,B,C,D,F), 4(A), 7(C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Muenchow	Kurt	Morrison, CO	Personal Letter	586	DEIS	1, 2(A,B,C,D,F), 4(A), 5(A), 6(A,B,D,E), 7(E), 8(2), 9(B), 12(3), 15(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Murphy	Jerry L.	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	587	DEIS	10(A,B), 11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Murphy	Marcia	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	461	DEIS	10(A), 11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Murphy	Ruth	Arvada, CO	Personal Letter	462	DEIS	3(A), 8(G), 12(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Murphy	Ruth Mary		Personal Letter	5297	SDEIS	3(A), 12(A), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Murphy	Ruth Mary	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #5	5348	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Nau	J.B.	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	463	DEIS	2(B,E), 4(E), 15(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Neale	Terry	Bailey, CO	Comment Sheet	5196	SDEIS	12(I), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Nelson	Mary Jo	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	55	DEIS	2(C), 3(C,E,J), 8(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Nelson	Mary Jo	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	706	DEIS	2(C), 3(C,E,J), 8(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Nelson	Mary Jo		Personal Letter	5496	SDEIS	2(A), 3(A), 8(A,C), 12(G), 24(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Nelson	Noel		Form Letter #1	176	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Nelson	Robert A.	Golden, CO	Personal Letter	588	DEIS	1, 3(A), 4(A), 5(A,E), 8(C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Nelson	Robert A.		Personal Letter	5445	SDEIS	22, 28(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Nent	Lori		Form Letter #5	5533	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Neumann	Claude		Comment Sheet	515	DEIS	7(A), 9(F)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Nicklas	Jim		Personal Letter	56	DEIS	2(A,B), 8(E), 9(F), 15(A,B,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Nikkel	Dave	Littleton, CO	Comment Sheet	5202	SDEIS	12(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Nisco	Alessandra	Telluride, CO	Personal Letter	464	DEIS	3(A,B,F,J), 5(B), 8(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Nisler	Paul	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #2	5337	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Noel	Cyndy	Colorado Springs, CO	Form Letter #2	5335	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Noraden	Elizabeth		Personal Letter	5415	SDEIS	12(A), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Norton	Marcella D.	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	465	DEIS	3(D,J), 4(A), 12(A,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Norton	Marcella D.		Form Letter #5	5538	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Oakes	Bill	Aurora, CO	Personal Letter	595	DEIS	3(A), 4(A), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Olinco	Dan and Ruth	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	5296	SDEIS	2(A), 8(D), 24(A), 26, 28(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Olinco	Ruth & Dan	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	466	DEIS	2(C,D), 3(G), 5(B,E), 8(B,E,F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Oliver	Wendy	Buena Vista, CO	Personal Letter	596	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 4(A), 5(E), 8(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Onago	Nancy A.	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	467	DEIS	2(A,C,D), 3(D), 4(A), 9(C), 16(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Osborn	Jerry	Littleton, CO	Personal Letter	597	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 3(A), 8(G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Otto	Elizabeth	Lakewood, CO	Personal Letter	5318	SDEIS	26(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Otto	Elizabeth	Idaho Springs, CO	Personal Letter	468	DEIS	2(A,B,D), 3(D), 7(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Overpeck	Kim and John		Form Letter #5	5531	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		P.	E.B.		Personal Letter	233	DEIS	8(G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Page	Barbara		Personal Letter	469	DEIS	3(A,D), 4(A), 5(A,B,C,E), 9(E), 12(I), 16(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Page	Barbara		Personal Letter	5471	SDEIS	12(I), 16(E,C), 17, 23(P,R,Z), 24(B)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Palmer	Sandra L.	Denver, CO	Form Letter #1	256	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Parker	Nina and Larry		Personal Letter	5477	SDEIS	2(A,D), 3(A), 8(G), 17, 26(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Parsons	Harry	Morrison, CO	Personal Letter	5247	SDEIS	3(A), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Parsons	Harry V.	Morrison, CO	Personal Letter	470	DEIS	3(I), 8(B), 9(C), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Passas	Delinda and Christopher		Personal Letter	5497	SDEIS	8(D), 12(A), 16(D), 23(Z)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Pate	Bill	Joplin, MO	Personal Letter	5355	SDEIS	8(G), 12(A,I), 24(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Patterson	Ned	St. Paul, MN	Form Letter #2	5326	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Patterson	Sally D.	St. Paul, MN	Personal Letter	471	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 3(A,H), 4(A), 8(B), 9(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Patterson	Sally D.	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #5	5344	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Patterson	Thomas	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #5	5345	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Patton	Brenda	Littleton, CO	Personal Letter	472	DEIS	2(A,B,C,D), 3(A), 7(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Patton	John W.	St. Paul, MN	Form Letter #2	5330	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Paul	Sophia	Bailey, CO	Comment Sheet	17	DEIS	2(A), 7(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Pedersen	Pilar	Boulder, CO	Personal Letter	57	DEIS	2(B,C,D), 3(I), 8(G), 12(E,I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Pedeuen	Pilar		Personal Letter	5430	SDEIS	3(A), 8(G), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Pedlow	Kerry, Joyce, Margaret	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #5	5270	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Pequette	James	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	58	DEIS	1, 2(B,C), 3(A,C,D,J), 7(A), 8(F), 9(B), 12(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Pequette			Personal Letter	5429	SDEIS	24(B), 26, 33, 35
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Person	Deanna		Form Letter #1	99	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Peters	Donna		Form Letter #5	5400	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Peters	John A.		Form Letter #2	5390	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Peters	Johnny	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	5216	SDEIS	2(A), 3(A,B), 23(F,P,M)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Phillips and Masters	Wendy and Ellen J.		Form Letter #3	5518	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Pinkowitz	Susan F.		Personal Letter	5467	SDEIS	8(G), 9(C), 16(B,C,D), 17, 24(A,B), 26, 28(D), 29(A,D), 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Pinkowitz	Tod		Personal Letter	5486	SDEIS	5(B,E), 23(H,O,Z), 24(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Plutt	Steve	Lake George	Personal Letter	598	DEIS	2(D), 7(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Polhemus			Personal Letter	473	DEIS	2(A,E), 3(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Poor			Form Letter #1	100	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Powell	Dienne	Idaho Springs, CO	Personal Letter	59	DEIS	2(A,B,C,D), 5(B), 7(A), 8(F), 9(B), 12(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Primus	Robert J.	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	5231	SDEIS	24(B), 26, 28(B), 29(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Primus	Robert J.	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	5378	SDEIS	23(F), 28(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Pugh	W.A.		Form Letter #5	5399	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Puzitar	Robert M		Form Letter #4	5274	SDEIS	2(A), 4(F), 5(C), 16, 28(F,H), 29
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Pyle	J.E.		Personal Letter	5422	SDEIS	24(B), 26, 35
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Rachel	Naomi	Boulder, CO	Personal Letter	61	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 3(A,J), 5(B), 12(D,H)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Rachel	Naomi	Boulder, CO	Personal Letter	5305	SDEIS	26(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Radovich	Nicholas D.	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	599	DEIS	2(A,B), 5(A,B,C), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Rapp	Ed	Dumont, CO	Personal Letter	5213	SDEIS	18, 19, 20, 21, 22
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Raup	Toni	Phoenix, AZ	Personal Letter	474	DEIS	2(A,C,D), 8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Raup	Toni		Personal Letter	5314	SDEIS	26

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Reed	Nora	Ex. Springs	Personal Letter	5280	SDEIS	2C, 3(A), 8, 23(D), 28(A,B,F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Reiquam	Bill and Elenor	Lakewood, CO	Personal Letter	5230	SDEIS	8(G), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Reynolds	Marianne		Form Letter #1	101	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Reynolds	Marianne	Lakewood, CO	Form Letter #4	5343	SDEIS	2(A), 4(F), 5(C), 16, 28(F,H), 29
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Reynolds	Marlin	Lexington	Form Letter #2	5263	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Rhodes	Marilyn	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	475	DEIS	2(D), 7(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Richie	Page D.		Personal Letter	5370	SDEIS	2(D), 3(A,B), 5(C,E),12(I), 23(L)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Robertson	Alex		Personal E-Mail	211	DEIS	4(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Robinson	Lisa	Grant, CO	Personal Letter	600	DEIS	1, 3(F), 15(D), 16(C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Robinson	Roy E,	Denver, CO	Form Letter #2	5130	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Rodina	Christine	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	5357	SDEIS	2(A), 3(A), 8(G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Roe	John & Sandra	Minneapolis, MN	Personal Letter	5184	SDEIS	2(F), 3(A),12(I),15(A), 24(B), 28(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Roe	John & Sandra	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #5	5266	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Roe	Katharine	St. Paul, MN	Form Letter #2	5339	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Roe	Sandra B	Saint Paul, MN	Personal Letter	601	DEIS	2(B), 3(C), 7(G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Roe	Suca J. and David B		Personal Letter	5443	SDEIS	3(A), 26, 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Roeh	Teri		Form Letter #1	177	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Rogers	Buck & Mary	Perry	Personal Letter	5222	SDEIS	23(F,P,N,U,A), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Rosenfeld	Ruth K.	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	602	DEIS	2(B,D), 3(A,H), 4(A), 5(B), 8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Roske	Waron		Personal Letter	5311	SDEIS	12(A), 26(A), 29

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Roske	Warren	Golden, CO	Personal Letter	476	DEIS	2(A,C,D), 12(I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ross	Grady		Personal Letter	5503	SDEIS	2(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Rossmiller	Gary A.	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	603	DEIS	2(B,D), 3(A), 4(B), 8(C), 9(C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Rotigan	Barbara and John		Form Letter #5	5807	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Roubos	Terie		Personal Letter	5775	SDEIS	8(G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ruhoff	Ron	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	477	DEIS	2(C), 4(A), 7(A), 9(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Russack	Sid		Personal E-Mail	522	DEIS	14(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Rutherford	Frank "Buff" and Mary Lou		Form Letter #5	5540	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Rutter	Anita	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	578	DEIS	3(A,J), 8(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ryan	Marlys K.	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	478	DEIS	11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Sample	Joan		Personal Letter	5484	SDEIS	12(A), 23(S), 24(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Sanders	Helen	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	479	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 3(A,E), 4(A,E), 12(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Sanders	Helen	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	5366	SDEIS	2(B), 3(A), 5(E), 17, 24(B), 26(A), 28(B), 32
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Sanders & Temple	Laura-Neta & Len	Idaho Springs, CO	Comment Sheet	205	DEIS	2(A,B,C,E), 3(B), 8(G), 12(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Sarne	Julie	St. Paul, MN	Form Letter #2	5327	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Saum	George H.	Agate, CO	Personal E-Mail	28	DEIS	2(A), 3(B), 5(D), 8(E), 9(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Schach	Ray	Lakewood, CO	Personal Letter	5380	SDEIS	10(A), 11, 22
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Schaefer	Susan		Personal Letter	5411	SDEIS	24(B), 29(C,F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Scheerer	Mr F.R.	Grant, CO	Comment Sheet	206	DEIS	4(B), 10(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Scherer	Dave	South Fork, CO	Personal Letter	604	DEIS	8

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Schmalz	Ted and Mary		Form Letter #3	5785	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Schmidt	Janet		Form Letter #2	5388	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Schobinger	Charles W.		Personal Letter	605	DEIS	3(H), 12(G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Schomberg	Mr & Mrs A. Thomas		Personal Letter	481	DEIS	2(A,C,D), 7(A), 9(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Schreier	Susan M.		Form Letter #5	5529	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Schreiner	John	Rural Clear Creek County	Comment Sheet	207	DEIS	2(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Scott	Gates & Sara		Personal Letter	482	DEIS	2(A,B,C,E), 3(C,D,J), 5(B), 8(D), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Scott	Julia and William		Personal Letter	5759	SDEIS	12(A), 24(B), 29(A,C), 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Scott	Julie	Englewood, CO	Personal Letter	62	DEIS	REQUEST COPY OF EIS
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Scott	Mr & Mrs WM L.		Form Letter #1	102	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Scott	Patrica		Personal Letter	167	DEIS	2(C,D), 3(A), 4(A), 8(G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Scott	Patricia A.	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #5	5351	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Seeley and Eagle	Richard H. and Lynda		Form Letter #5	5796	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Seeley and Eagle	Richard H. and Lynda		Personal Letter	5498	SDEIS	16(B,C,D,E), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Seeley and Eagle	Richard H. and Lynda		Personal Letter	5499	SDEIS	5(C), 16(B,C,D,E), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Seeley and Eagle	Richard H. and Lynda		Personal Letter	5772	SDEIS	16(B,C,D), 23(P), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Selby	Alice		Form Letter #3	5517	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Semler	Roger	Kalispell, MT	Personal Letter	64	DEIS	1, 2(B,C), 3(A,B,C,D,E), 5(A,E), 12(D,E,I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Semler	Roger	Kalispell, MT	Personal Letter	707	DEIS	1, 2(B,C), 3(A,B,C,D,E), 5(A,E), 12(D,E,I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Shaw	John and Melody		Form Letter #2	5392	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Shea	Charles		Personal Letter	5375	SDEIS	3(A), 15(B), 24(B), 26, 33, 35
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Shea	Charles		Form Letter #5	5757	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Shea	Susan		Personal Letter	5376	SDEIS	3(A), 15(B), 24(B), 26, 33, 35
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Shelton	Catherine K.	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	606	DEIS	2(B,C,D), 3(J), 5(A,B), 12(A,G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Shield	Samuel		Personal Letter	65	DEIS	3(A,J), 4(A,E), 5(B,C), 8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Sitzman	Betty J.		Form Letter #2	5766	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Sitzman	Betty, J.	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	232	DEIS	3(A,D,J), 12(I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Skeen	Cynthia	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	168	DEIS	4(B,E), 7(A,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Skeen	Cynthia		Personal Letter	5485	SDEIS	2(A), 7(A), 16(D), 28(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Slattery	Dan		Personal Letter	5421	SDEIS	2(B), 5(E), 17, 24(B), 26, 29(A), 35
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Slavec	Paul		Personal Letter	5308	SDEIS	12(A), 26(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Smith	Antonettee DeLauro	Englewood, CO	Personal Letter	5191	SDEIS	3(B), 8(G), 24(B), 29
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Smith	Barton B.		Personal Letter	5419	SDEIS	3(A), 8(G), 24(C), 26, 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Smith	Dorothy		Form Letter #1	257	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Smith	Robert C.		Comment Sheet	5226	SDEIS	22, 28(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Smith	Robert C.		Comment Sheet	5284	SDEIS	10(A), 11, 22, 28(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Snodgrass	Brent		Personal Letter	483	DEIS	1, 2(A,B,C,D), 4(C), 5(A,B), 8(G), 12(D,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Snyder	Pat		Personal Letter	5313	SDEIS	2(E), 3(A), 26(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Sorensen	Patricia	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	484	DEIS	2(B), 12(I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Speaks	William	Lakewood, CO	Comment Sheet	19	DEIS	2C, 5(B), 8(D), 13(A)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Spector	Cheryl A.		Form Letter #2	5809	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Spezia	John	Steamboat Springs, CO	Personal Letter	67	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 5(B,E), 12(D,E,I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Spielman	Malcolm and Robbie		Form Letter #4	5276	SDEIS	2(A), 4(F), 5(C), 16, 28(F,H), 29
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Spielman	Roberta		Form Letter #1	103	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Spiller	Dianne		Personal E-Mail	212	DEIS	4(B), 14(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Springer	Chemaine		Personal Letter	5494	SDEIS	3(A), 8(C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Springer	Joseph		Personal Letter	5754	SDEIS	2(D), 3(B), 8(G), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Stacy	Richard	Montrose, CO	Personal Letter	5183	SDEIS	2(A), 12(G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Stacy	Richard D.	Montrose, CO	Personal Letter	607	DEIS	1, 10(B), 11, 16
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Stahl	Mark A & Bobbie Jo	Lakewood, CO	Personal Letter	608	DEIS	2(B), 3(J), 8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Stanbogh	Leo		Form Letter #3	5521	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Stanley	Paul & Janet	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	68	DEIS	2(D,E), 3(A,D), 9(F), 12(E,I)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Starbuck	Joanne M.	Littleton, CO	Form Letter #2	5258	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Stavy	Michael	Chicago, IL	Personal Letter	5321	SDEIS	2(C), 12(I), 26, 33, 35
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Steele	Steven M.		Personal Letter	5472	SDEIS	4(E), 8(G), 24(A,B), 28(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Stevens	Carl	Wheat Ridge, CO	Personal Letter	69	DEIS	3(A), 7(A,G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Stibeeel	James		Form Letter #3	5522	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Stokes	Dennis B.	Boulder, CO	Personal Letter	5299	SDEIS	2(A), 8(G), 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Stokes	Ellen C	Boulder, CO	Personal Letter	5363	SDEIS	2(A), 3(A), 17
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Stokstad	Peggy		Telephone Conversation Record	5449	SDEIS	10(C), 11(C)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Stokstad	Peggy		Personal Letter	5462	SDEIS	11C, 23, 28
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Stowell	John		Personal E-Mail	523	DEIS	2(A,D), 3(A,J), 8(C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Straub	Cherie & Russ	South Dartmouth/Evergreen, MA/CO	Personal Letter	485	DEIS	3(A,B,C), 3(A,J), 8(G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Straub	Cherrie	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	5369	SDEIS	3(A), 24(B), 26(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Straub	D'Arcy	Littleton, CO	Personal Letter	609	DEIS	1, 14(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Straub	D'Arcy		Personal Letter	5475	SDEIS	2(A,B), 3(B), 5(F), 9(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Streete	John L.	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	486	DEIS	2(A,C), 12(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Sullivan	Colleen		Personal Letter	5764	SDEIS	12(A), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Sullivan	Dale	Houston, TX	Personal Letter	169	DEIS	2(A,C,D), 3(J), 8(C), 12(H)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Sush	Britt	Sante Fe, NM	Form Letter #2	5261	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Sustern	Britt		Form Letter #5	5799	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Sweetser	Elliot	Lakewood, CO	Personal Letter	5206	SDEIS	29(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Swem	Helen and Theodor		Personal Letter	5438	SDEIS	4(E), 8(G), 17, 24(A), 28(D), 29(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Swem	Theodor & Helen	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	610	DEIS	1, 2(A,D,F), 3(C), 4(A,E), 5(B), 7(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Swett	Sondra	Salida, CO	Personal Letter	5358	SDEIS	2(A), 8(G), 24(A), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Swift	Kevin		Form Letter #5	5798	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Sykes	Virginia	Golden, CO	Personal Letter	611	DEIS	2(C), 3(J), 8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Sylvester	Les & Martha-Ann		Personal Letter	612	DEIS	2(C), 3(A), 5(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Tauriello	Daniel	Conifer, CO	Personal Letter	613	DEIS	2(A,C), 5(A,B), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Taylor	Jan	Devon, England	Personal Letter	5322	SDEIS	3(A), 8, 16(E,D)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Terrell	Lawrence P.	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	487	DEIS	1, 2(A,B,C,F,G), 3(A), 5(B,E), 7(E,G), 8(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Terrell	Lawrence P.		Personal Letter	5436	SDEIS	2(B), 5(E), 24(A,B), 26(A), 28(D), 29(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Terry	Linda & Bob		Personal Letter	70	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 4(A), 12(E,I), 15(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Tesky	Barbara		Personal Letter	5483	SDEIS	26, 33, 35
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Tesky	Jonathan	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	5320	SDEIS	3(A), 29(C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Tesky	Jonathan		Personal Letter	5319	SDEIS	2(A,D), 3(A), 8(B,G,H), 26(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Tesky	Jonathan C.		Personal Email	5250	SDEIS	2(A,D), 3(A), 8(B,G,H), 24(B), 26(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Thach	Catherine A.	Lakewood, CO	Personal Letter	614	DEIS	2(C,D), 3(D), 4(A,E), 8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Thach	Catherine A.	Lakewood, CO	Personal Letter	708	DEIS	2(C,D), 3(D), 4(A,E), 8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Thompson	Grace		Form Letter #1	104	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Tibbs	Bob		Form Letter #3	5340	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Tibbs	Bob and Konin	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #5	5347	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Tiglsy	Brian	Empire, CO	Form Letter #2	5255	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Tinberry	Leroy		Form Letter #5	5537	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Tolpo	Carolyn	Shawnee, CO	Comment Sheet	20	DEIS	3(A,H), 7(A,G), 8(C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Tolpo	Vincent & Carolyn	Shawnee, CO	Personal Letter	488	DEIS	2(B,C,G), 3(A,H), 5(B,E), 7(A,B,D,F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Tomasi	Edwin J & Nell	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	615	DEIS	1, 3(A,H), 4(A), 7(B), 12(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Tomocik	Joe	Denver, CO	Comment Sheet	208	DEIS	11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Torok-Glover	Patricia A. and Brian A.		Personal Letter	5434	SDEIS	2(A,B), 3(A), 5(E), 12(D), 17, 23(C,Q), 24(A,B), 26, 28(B,D), 29(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Townsend	Barbara		Form Letter #1	105	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Trelease-Bell	Amy	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	5364	SDEIS	3(A), 26, 28(B,F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Tullberg	Karen	Lakewood, CO	Form Letter #2	5333	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unger	Joel	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	616	DEIS	11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Upland	Chester R. and Virginia	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #5	5271	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Valentine	Sherri	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	617	DEIS	2(A,B,C,D), 7(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Valyburne	Glenn S.	Erie, CO	Form Letter #2	5332	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Van der Slice	John		Comment Sheet	146	DEIS	2(D,E), 3(H), 5(B,E), 7(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Van der Slice	John	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	489	DEIS	2(B,D,E), 3(B,H), 5(B,C), 7(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Van der Slice	John	Miami, FL	Form Letter #2	5386	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Vaughn	Cathy	Empire, CO	Comment Sheet	209	DEIS	8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Vaughn	Cathy		Personal Letter	5372	SDEIS	3(D), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ventimiglia	Lori		Personal Letter	490	DEIS	5(A,C), 9(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Vigil	Marilyn	Thorton, CO	Personal E-Mail	524	DEIS	2(A,B), 3(J), 8(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Vigor	William & Linda		Personal Letter	618	DEIS	8(G), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Wagner	Thomas & Kay	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	491	DEIS	7(A,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Wahlborg	Harold J.	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	5215	SDEIS	22, 23(C,D,F,Y)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Wahlborg	Maraday	Georgetown, CO	Personal Letter	171	DEIS	2(A,B), 3(A,C,J), 9(C), 12(D,E), 16(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Waldman	Lawrence S.	Morrison, CO	Personal Letter	492	DEIS	11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Walker	Louise C.	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	619	DEIS	2(B,C,F), 5(E), 8(E), 12(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Walker	Sheila	Denver, CO	Form Letter #2	5124	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Walters	John and Karen	Lakewood, CO	Personal Letter	5316	SDEIS	2(A), 3(A), 17
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Waltz	Phil	Littleton, CO	Personal Letter	172	DEIS	2(C,D), 5(D), 8(D,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ward	Bruce		Personal Letter	5409	SDEIS	10(A,B), 11
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ward	Thomas C.	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	620	DEIS	2(B,C,D), 5(B), 8(C), 12(D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Ward	Tim		Personal Letter	5458	SDEIS	2(A), 8(G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Wason	John E.	Evergreen, CO	Personal Letter	493	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E,G), 3(B,J), 9(C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Watson	Cathy	Georgetown, CO	Comment Sheet	21	DEIS	7(G), 12(A), 15(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Waugh and Martin	Eliza and Scott	Austin, TX	Form Letter #4	5342	SDEIS	2(A), 4(F), 5(C), 16, 28(F,H), 29
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Weisner	Mrs. W.J.	Columbus, IL	Personal Letter	173	DEIS	2(B,C), 3(A,B,J), 8(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Wells	Marion & Jeff	Conifer, CO	Comment Sheet	22	DEIS	2(D), 5(B,E), 12(A,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Wendell	Roger J.		Telephone Conversation Record	5470	SDEIS	2(A,B), 3(B), 8(G), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Werblake	Kay		Personal Letter	5468	SDEIS	2(A), 4(E), 24(B), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Werlin	Peter and Kim	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #5	5346	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		West	Mary E.	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	494	DEIS	10(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		West	Mary Eabels	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	5283	SDEIS	10(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Westlye	Jane		Form Letter #1	106	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Whitcomb	Joyce		Personal Letter	621	DEIS	2(B,C), 3(B), 5(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		White	Larry		Personal Letter	622	DEIS	1, 5(A,B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Wicks	Dave	Colorado Springs, CO	Personal Letter	495	DEIS	2(A,B,F), 3(D), 5(B), 8(2), 12(1)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Wilhour	Jane H.		Personal Letter	5301	SDEIS	12(A), 23(P,Z), 26, 28(B,F), 33

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Wilkins	Anne	Georgetown, CO	Personal E-Mail	525	DEIS	2(C,D), 5(A,B,E), 8(F), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Wilkins	Gary L.	Georgetown, CO	Personal E-Mail	526	DEIS	1, 2(A,B), 3(B,C), 5(C,E), 8(C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Willard	LeRoy		Personal Letter	5489	SDEIS	2(B), 3(A), 9(F), 24(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Willhour	James R.		Personal Letter	5774	SDEIS	3(A), 12(D), 16(D), 23(Z), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Willhour	Robert R.		Personal Letter	5300	SDEIS	12(A), 23(P,Z), 26, 28(B,F), 33
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Williams	Marie Claude		Form Letter #3	5789	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Williams	Marie Claude		Form Letter #5	5801	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Wilson	Linda	Tabernash, CO	Personal Letter	496	DEIS	2(A,D), 3(D), 5(E), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Wilson	Tom		Form Letter #3	5788	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Wilson	Tom		Form Letter #5	5802	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Windemuller	Douglas L	Pine, CO	Comment Sheet	516	DEIS	2(D), 7(D), 15(D), 16(C)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Winter	Kay	Denver, CO	Personal Email	5189	SDEIS	24(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Winter	Sandra Kay	Denver, CO	Personal Letter	71	DEIS	2(A,D,E), 3(A,B,C,D), 4(A,E), 9(C,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Wolf	Pauline and M.		Form Letter #5	5758	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Wood			Form Letter #1	107	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Woodard	Ben	Lakewood, CO	Personal Letter	623	DEIS	2(A,C), 3(A), 5(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Woodard	Laura	Lakewood, CO	Personal Letter	709	DEIS	5(B,D), 8(E,F,G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Woodland	Shirley	Pine, CO	Comment Sheet	210	DEIS	2(B,C,D), 4(D), 6(F), 8(G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Woods	Julie		Personal Letter	5773	SDEIS	2(A), 3(A), 16(C,D), 26(A), 29C
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Woods	Ruthann	Conifer, CO	Personal Letter	497	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 3(A,J), 12(I)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Writer	Gwendolyn	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #3	5265	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Writer	Gwendolyn	Georgetown, CO	Form Letter #5	5267	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Zietz	Marion	Lakewood, CO	Personal Letter	624	DEIS	2(B), 3(A), 8(G)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		None Given	Nick	Loveland, CO	Personal Email	5220	SDEIS	3(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unknown			Comment Sheet	5207	SDEIS	10(B)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unknown			Comment Sheet	5211	SDEIS	22
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable	Bill & Jill	Grand Junction, CO	Personal Letter	625	DEIS	12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable	David		Form Letter #5	5532	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Personal Letter	73	DEIS	4(A,E), 8(F), 9(B), 12(E), 16(E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Personal Letter	74	DEIS	2(A,B,C,E)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	108	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	109	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	110	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	111	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	112	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	113	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	114	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	115	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	116	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	117	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	118	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	119	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	178	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	179	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	180	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	181	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	182	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	183	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	184	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	185	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	258	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	259	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	260	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #1	261	DEIS	2(B,C,D,E), 3(A), 12(E,I), 16(A,B,C,D)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable		Denver, CO	Personal Letter	626	DEIS	2(C), 12(A)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable		Morrison, CO	Form Letter #2	5123	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable		St. Paul, MN	Form Letter #2	5325	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable		St. Paul, MN	Form Letter #2	5329	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable		Lakewood, CO	Form Letter #2	5338	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #3	5519	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #2	5782	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #3	5786	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #3	5787	SDEIS	23(N,D,P,T), 26, 28(F,H), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #5	5793	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
II. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION		Unreadable			Form Letter #5	5797	SDEIS	12(I), 23(Z), 24(B), 26(A), 28(B,F), 29(F)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Abbey	Ann	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	829	DEIS	5(E), 9(B), 16(D,E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Allen	Barbara	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	814	DEIS	12(D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Allen	Chris	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	800	DEIS	8(D), 9(C), 16(B,E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Allen	Christopher	Silver Plume, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	873	DEIS	9(E,G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Anderson	Coralue	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	726	DEIS	1, 2(A), 3(C,H), 6(E), 7(C), 9(B), 12(I), 15(A,B), 16(C,D,E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Anderson	Coralue	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	838	DEIS	1, 2(A), 3(H), 4(E), 9(E), 16(B,C,D,E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Anderson	Coralue		DEIS Public Hearing	849	DEIS	7(A,E,F)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Anderson	Coralue		DEIS Public Hearing	874	DEIS	1, 4(A), 5(A), 6(B), 7(B), 12(I), 16(C)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Anderson	Coralue		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5044	SDEIS	1, 23(F,P,D,J), 28(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Anderson	Coralue		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5049	SDEIS	12(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Anderson	Coralue		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5096	SDEIS	23(P,F), 26
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Anderson	Coralue		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5107	SDEIS	23(U,A,J), 26(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Anderson	Henry K. Jr.	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	808	DEIS	1, 2(B,C), 5(C), 6(A), 8(E,G), 13(A,B), 15(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Anderson	Smoky		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5033	SDEIS	23(P,O)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Anderson	Wendy	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	817	DEIS	4(A), 7(A,G)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Andrew	Mel		DEIS Public Hearing	877	DEIS	1, 2(B), 9(F), 12(E,I)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Angell	Elissa	Denver, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	711	DEIS	1, 2(A,C,D), 3(E), 5(B), 6(B,E), 8(E), 14(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Angell	Elissa	Denver, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	731	DEIS	1, 2(B,C), 6(E), 8
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Angell	Elissa	Denver, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	732	DEIS	1, 2(C)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Angell	Elissa		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5071	SDEIS	23(J), 26(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Angell	Elissa		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5086	SDEIS	23(O)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Anonymous			DEIS Public Hearing	714	DEIS	7(F), 10
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Armbrust	Lewis	Evergreen, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	715	DEIS	2(A,B,C,D), 3(A), 5(A,B), 8(D,F), 9(B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Armburst	William	Kittredge, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	716	DEIS	2(D), 3(A), 9(B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Ashmore	Patrick K.	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	827	DEIS	12(A,B), 15(B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Axley	Hartman	Denver, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	794	DEIS	2(A,D,E), 3(A), 5(E), 8(F,G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Bacigalupi	Tod	Conifer, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	768	DEIS	12(I)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Bacigalupi	Tod		DEIS Public Hearing	847	DEIS	1, 4(A), 5(E), 7(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Bacigalupi	Tod		DEIS Public Hearing	882	DEIS	1, 2(A), 6(A,C), 7(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Bacigalupi	Todd		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5072	SDEIS	23(U,I), 29(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Bacigalupi	Todd		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5110	SDEIS	23(V)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Bahrens	Lee		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5027	SDEIS	28(C)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Bahrens	Lee		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5034	SDEIS	23(O)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Bahrens	Lee		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5062	SDEIS	23(O)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Bell	Janice	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	825	DEIS	9(E), 12(D,I)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Bell	Richard	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	824	DEIS	4(C), 7(A), 12(I)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Bell	Richard		DEIS Public Hearing	875	DEIS	4(A), 15(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Bennett	Maureen		DEIS Public Hearing	891	DEIS	4(A), 5(A,B,C,E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Bennett	Maureen		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5056	SDEIS	5(A,B), 17
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Bertoli	Rita		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5080	SDEIS	2(A), 3(B), 23(U)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Bertolli	Rita	Lakewood, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	773	DEIS	3(C,G,I), 5(A,D,E), 8(B,C), 12(H)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Bleesz	Mary		DEIS Public Hearing	876	DEIS	1, 2(B), 3(C), 7(B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Bolyn	Jan		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5115	SDEIS	10(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Bowes	Tyler		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5085	SDEIS	28(D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Bowman	Marci	Idaho Springs, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	718	DEIS	2(D), 12(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Buckland	Phil	Empire, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	775	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 3(B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Buckland	Phil		DEIS Public Hearing	887	DEIS	11
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Buckland	Sally		DEIS Public Hearing	885	DEIS	1, 11
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Buckland	Sally Guanella	Empire, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	803	DEIS	11
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Buckland	Sally Guanella		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5090	SDEIS	10(C), 11
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Burrows	Dick	Conifer, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	750	DEIS	2(A,F), 6(E), 12(E,I)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Burrows	Dick		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5009	SDEIS	2(A), 3(B), 12(H)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Calhoun	John	Silver Plume, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	770	DEIS	1, 2(F), 3(A,D,G,I), 4(E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Capps	Wes	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	798	DEIS	2(A,D), 3(A,B,D,E), 12(G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Carpenter	Dave	Shawnee, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	740	DEIS	2(A), 5(A,B)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Carpenter	David		DEIS Public Hearing	845	DEIS	9(E), 12(G,I)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Champion	Ann	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	812	DEIS	3(A,B), 12(D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Champion	Charles	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	813	DEIS	5(A,B), 8(G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Chandler	Polly	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	790	DEIS	3(A,E), 6(D), 8(E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Church	Kasey		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5008	SDEIS	27
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Claus	Janet		DEIS Public Hearing	871	DEIS	1, 2(A,D), 3(H), 4(A,C), 7(A), 12(D,E), 15(B), 16(C,D,E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Corkern	Trey	Grant, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	736	DEIS	2(A,E), 3(B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Crespo	Kathy	Pine, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	746	DEIS	2(A,D,E), 8, 12(D,I)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Debenham	Etta	Evergreen, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	807	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 7(D,G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Debenham	Etta		DEIS Public Hearing	879	DEIS	1, 2(A,B,C), 3(A,E,H), 4(A,C), 5(B), 7(B), 12(D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Delange	CJ		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5076	SDEIS	11
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Delange	CJ		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5078	SDEIS	22(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		DeLong	Jim	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	818	DEIS	7(E), 12(I)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		DeLong	Jim		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5092	SDEIS	12(I), 23(O), 29(C)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Denver	Bruce		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5088	SDEIS	23(N), 30
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Divis	Pat	Bailey, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	737	DEIS	2(A,D), 3(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Divis	Pat		DEIS Public Hearing	850	DEIS	3(D), 9(B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Drucker	Dan		DEIS Public Hearing	853	DEIS	1, 2(B,D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Dugan	Megan	Grant, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	756	DEIS	8
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Dugan	Megan		DEIS Public Hearing	863	DEIS	8(E), 16(E)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Dugan	Megan		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5001	SDEIS	17, 26
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Dugan	Megan		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5024	SDEIS	5(B), 17, 23(L,M,N,O), 26
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Dugan	Megan		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5055	SDEIS	17, 23(S,O), 25
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Dugan	Scott	Grant, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	758	DEIS	3(C,D), 5(A,B), 8
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Dugan	Scott		DEIS Public Hearing	856	DEIS	8(E), 9(F)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Dugan	Scott		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5023	SDEIS	17, 24(B), 26, 29
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Dugan	Scott		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5042	SDEIS	3(L), 17, 23(N)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Eichler	Garth		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5002	SDEIS	17, 26
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Eichler	Garth		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5019	SDEIS	3(A), 5(A), 23(K)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Enochs	John	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	783	DEIS	8(E), 12(D), 15(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Fabyanic	Jerry	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	795	DEIS	2(B,D), 3(E), 5(B), 12(D,H), 15(B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Faircloth	Phil	Bailey, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	786	DEIS	2(D), 8(E,F)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Ferrin	Bruce	Bailey, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	749	DEIS	4(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Ferrin	Bruce		DEIS Public Hearing	851	DEIS	1, 2(A,E,D), 3(A,B,D), 4(E), 9(G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Ferrin	Judy	Bailey, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	748	DEIS	3(A), 9(C), 12(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Foster	Mike	Golden, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	713	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 5(C,E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Frost	George		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5026	SDEIS	12(G), 17, 24(B), 28(B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Garinger	Rube		DEIS Public Hearing	884	DEIS	2(A), 4(A,E), 9(F)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Gordon	Bill		DEIS Public Hearing	840	DEIS	1, 2(A,C)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Gordon	Jim	Grant, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	741	DEIS	4(A,B,E), 8

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Gordon	Mary Dale	Grant, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	739	DEIS	3(F), 8, 15(D), 16(C)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Gordon	Mary Dale		DEIS Public Hearing	862	DEIS	2(A), 3(A,C,J)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Gordon	Mary Dale		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5000	SDEIS	17, 26
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Gordon	Mary Dale		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5022	SDEIS	3(A), 8(G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Gordon	Rob	Grant, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	728	DEIS	8(E), 9(B,G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Gordon	Rob		DEIS Public Hearing	854	DEIS	4(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Gordon	Rob		DEIS Public Hearing	869	DEIS	3(A), 5(E), 6(B), 8(E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Gorringer	Ruben F.	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	816	DEIS	2(A,C), 3(A), 4(A,E), 5(B), 8(A), 9(F), 13(A,B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Gotschalk	Libbie	Littleton, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	820	DEIS	3(G), 5(E), 7(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Gottschalk	Libbie	Littleton, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	721	DEIS	2(B,C), 3(A), 5(A), 8, 12(I)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Gottschalle	Libbie		DEIS Public Hearing	870	DEIS	1, 2(B,C), 6(A), 7(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Gottshalk	Libby		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5082	SDEIS	23(P,D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Gottshalk	Libby		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5094	SDEIS	17, 26(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Greksa	Mark	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	793	DEIS	2(A), 5(A,B,C,E), 12(E,I), 15(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Greksa	Mark		DEIS Public Hearing	892	DEIS	2(A,B,D), 3(A,C), 5(B,C), 7(1), 8(2), 12(D,H), 15(B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Griffin	Karen	Pine, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	747	DEIS	1, 2(B,C,F), 3(A), 5(B,C), 9(C), 12(H)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Guanella	Glenda	Empire, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	778	DEIS	11, 21
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Gulley, Jr.	J .L.	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	797	DEIS	9(C), 12(E,I)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Hallberg	Mary Ellen	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	815	DEIS	3(A), 7(A), 16(C,E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Hartl	Joe	Bailey, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	811	DEIS	4(E), 8(D), 9(F)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Hartong	Bill	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	785	DEIS	20, 21
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Hartong	Elaine	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	784	DEIS	8(E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Harvey	Edward	Grant, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	738	DEIS	2(A,C), 3(F), 8, 15(D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Harvey	Edward		DEIS Public Hearing	841	DEIS	8(E), 9(E,F)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Hisgen	Harv	Golden, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	729	DEIS	14(C)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Holmes	Julie	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	765	DEIS	10(A), 11
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Holmes	Julie		DEIS Public Hearing	889	DEIS	10
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Holmes	Julie		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5098	SDEIS	7(A,G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Homes	Julie		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5017	SDEIS	2(B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Hotkins	Wilson	Denver, CO/Grant, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	753	DEIS	8(E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Houston	Rod		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5084	SDEIS	29
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Howell	Sue		DEIS Public Hearing	788	DEIS	2(D), 3(B,E), 5(B), 8(E,F)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Hunninen	Kathy		DEIS Public Hearing	890	DEIS	1, 2(E), 3(A), 4(E), 6(A,B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Hust	Frances		DEIS Public Hearing	878	DEIS	2(A,B), 5(B), 12(I)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Jackson	David		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5081	SDEIS	12(D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		James	Karen		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5053	SDEIS	3(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		James	Lynda		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5007	SDEIS	17, 23(B,F,C,D,E,G), 24(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Jeffers	Paul		DEIS Public Hearing	868	DEIS	2(A,C), 3(J), 12(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Jefferson	Mike		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5112	SDEIS	11
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Johnson	Violet	Idaho Springs, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	787	DEIS	7(G)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Jones	Bob		DEIS Public Hearing	866	DEIS	12(G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Jones	Bob		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5106	SDEIS	23(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Jones	Bob		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5108	SDEIS	23(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Jones	Dave	Evergreen, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	722	DEIS	13
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Jones	David		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5075	SDEIS	17, 22, 29(B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Joye	Darin		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5018	SDEIS	5(C,E), 23(J)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Kauffman	Jeff	Englewood, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	761	DEIS	2(A,B), 3(A), 8
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Keller	Linda		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5067	SDEIS	2(A), 3(A), 26(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Kelly	Glenn	Grant, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	760	DEIS	2(A,B), 3(A), 4(A), 5(B), 8
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Kelson	Betsy	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	836	DEIS	3(A,C,D,E), 5(E), 8(A,G), 9(F), 12 (B,I)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Kemple	Joan		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5100	SDEIS	29(C)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Kessler	Ron		DEIS Public Hearing	867	DEIS	2(D), 9(C)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Kingery	Gayle	Bailey, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	743	DEIS	8(G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Kingery	Richard A.	Bailey, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	744	DEIS	12(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Krueger	John	Evergreen, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	837	DEIS	2(A,B,D), 3(A), 4(D,E), 5(E), 7(A,C), 8(F), 16(C,D,E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Krueger	John		DEIS Public Hearing	843	DEIS	6(A), 7(A,C,D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Krueger	John		DEIS Public Hearing	872	DEIS	1, 2(B), 8(E), 9(B), 16(D,E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Krueger	John		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5048	SDEIS	23(O)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Krueger	John		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5050	SDEIS	28(C), 32
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Lahrman	James		DEIS Public Hearing	857	DEIS	1, 2(A), 3(A,D,E), 8(E)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Lambert	Ed	Evergreen, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	755	DEIS	2(C), 3(A), 8(D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Lands	Lark	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	796	DEIS	2(C), 3(B,D), 6(C,F), 13(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Lankford	Polly	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	822	DEIS	7(A,D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Larman	James		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5011	SDEIS	3(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Larrick	Louise G.	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	791	DEIS	2(B), 3(A,J), 4(A,B), 9(C)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Leland	Kathy		DEIS Public Hearing	893	DEIS	34
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Leven	Mark		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5104	SDEIS	23(A), 29
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Leven	Mark		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5111	SDEIS	23(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Lewis	Bob	Conifer, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	751	DEIS	7(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Lewis	Jean H.	Englewood, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	830	DEIS	3(A), 12(I)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Markovitz	Laurie	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	789	DEIS	4(D), 5(E), 8(F,G), 12(D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Marrone	Marty		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5032	SDEIS	23(P)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Marsh	Tracy	Fort Collins, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	757	DEIS	8
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Massey	Marlies	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	804	DEIS	2(A,D), 12(D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Massey	Rance	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	805	DEIS	2(B,C), 3C, 9(E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Miceli	Belinda	Pine, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	745	DEIS	8, 9(C)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Mickley	Ms.		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5051	SDEIS	23(L)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Millot	Martha		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5079	SDEIS	3(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Mlodzik	Roger	Pine, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	764	DEIS	11, 14(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Moore	Michael		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5089	SDEIS	23(F), 29(A,C)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Moore	Mike		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5065	SDEIS	12, 17
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Muenchow	Kurt	Morrison, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	712	DEIS	1, 2(A,E), 3(A), 5(B,E), 6(E), 8(B,C), 9(B,F)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Muenchow	Kurt	Morrison, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	723	DEIS	1, 2(B,C,D,F), 3(A), 4(A), 5(A,B,E), 6(A,B,D,E), 7(A,B),8(C), 9(F), 12(C,D), 15(D), 16(B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Muetz	Percy	Bailey, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	734	DEIS	2(A,D), 3(A), 4(A), 7, 20
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Murphy	Bennett	Grant, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	735	DEIS	3(F), 15(D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Murphy	Bennett		DEIS Public Hearing	842	DEIS	2(E), 8(E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Murphy	Bennit		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5005	SDEIS	8(E), 16(D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Neale	Terry		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5013	SDEIS	4(E), 5(F), 9(B), 16(D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Neely	Cynthia		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5093	SDEIS	16, 23(O), 29
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Neely	Cynthia C.	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	780	DEIS	1, 2(B,D), 3(A,D), 6(B), 12(I)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Nelson	Ken	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	819	DEIS	2(B), 9(B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Neville	Bob	Shawnee, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	752	DEIS	8(E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Nevious	Bill		DEIS Public Hearing	844	DEIS	6(A), 9(B,G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Nikkel	Dave		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5069	SDEIS	3(A), 24(C)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Nisler	Paul		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5037	SDEIS	23(M)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Novak	Diane		DEIS Public Hearing	858	DEIS	2(B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Olsen	Bill		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5102	SDEIS	23(E), 24(D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Page	Barb		DEIS Public Hearing	888	DEIS	1, 2(F), 3(A,J), 5(A,B), 9(B,E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Page	Barbara		DEIS Public Hearing	792	DEIS	5(B,C), 8(C), 12(D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Page	Barbara	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	802	DEIS	2(F), 13(A)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Page	Barbara		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5036	SDEIS	28(C), 30
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Page	Barbara		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5057	SDEIS	23(F,P,R)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Paterson	Jack	Littleton, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	730	DEIS	2(A,F), 5(B), 12(I)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Pequette	Jim	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	810	DEIS	6(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Pequette	Naomi	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	809	DEIS	2(A), 8(E,G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Peterson	Jim	Evergreen, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	769	DEIS	2(D), 4(A), 5(B), 8(C), 12(I)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Pinkowitz	Susan		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5012	SDEIS	23(G), 24(B), 26
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Pinkowitz	Ted		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5010	SDEIS	25
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Porter	Robert		DEIS Public Hearing	865	DEIS	1, 2(B), 4(A), 12(E,I)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Prendergast	Bob	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	826	DEIS	12(A,F)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Prendergast	Lynda	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	828	DEIS	7(A,F,G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Primus	Bob		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5039	SDEIS	23(D,N)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Primus	Bob		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5054	SDEIS	17
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Pyle	Jocelyn	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	777	DEIS	2(B,C), 8(B,E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Que	Wendel		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5116	SDEIS	29
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Radley	Christy		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5063	SDEIS	23(O)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Ravizzo	Aubrey		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5014	SDEIS	3(A), 23(J), 26
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Reichwein	Betty	Dumont	DEIS Public Hearing	806	DEIS	2(C), 8(B,C,E,G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Reichwein	Mel	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	774	DEIS	11
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Ruhter	Edward	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	835	DEIS	12(D)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Rutter	Tom	Denver, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	717	DEIS	2(A,D), 3(A,J), 6(E), 8(A,C)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Sanders	Bill	Idaho Springs, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	719	DEIS	2(A,B,D), 5(A,B), 6(E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Sanders	Helen	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	772	DEIS	2(A), 8(G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Scott	Bill	Englewood, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	724	DEIS	8
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Scott	Bill	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	831	DEIS	1, 2(A), 8(E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Scott	Greg		DEIS Public Hearing	880	DEIS	6(B,D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Scott	Jacob M.	Englewood, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	834	DEIS	2(F), 3(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Scott	Julia	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	832	DEIS	1, 3(H), 8(E), 12(H), 16(E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Scott	Julie	Englewood, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	725	DEIS	6(B), 8(E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Shimon	Shirley	Englewood, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	821	DEIS	7(A,E,F)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Shina	Shirley		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5061	SDEIS	23(N)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Shirlaw	Bob	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	771	DEIS	3(D), 7(E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Shirlaw	Jan		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5040	SDEIS	12(G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Shirlaw	Jan		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5058	SDEIS	30
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Skeen	Cynthia		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5029	SDEIS	24(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Skeen	Cynthia		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5031	SDEIS	23(G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Slavec	Paul	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	782	DEIS	8(E), 12(G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Smith	Kelly		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5003	SDEIS	17, 26
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Smith	Rocky	Denver, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	720	DEIS	1, 2(A,B,C,G), 3(A,H,J), 7(A), 8(G), 12(E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Smith	Shanna		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5004	SDEIS	17, 26

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Stauffer	Jack	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	776	DEIS	4(A), 18
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Stern	Mort		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5099	SDEIS	RELEVANCE OF COMMENTS
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Stimson	Nancy		DEIS Public Hearing	859	DEIS	1, 3(J), 8(G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Straub	D'Arcy		DEIS Public Hearing	864	DEIS	1, 2(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Sweetser	Elliot		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5091	SDEIS	2(A), 12(A), 29
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Tharp	Patty Jo	Evergreen, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	781	DEIS	12(D), 21
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Todd	Janet	Conifer, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	754	DEIS	2(A), 5(A), 9(C)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Tolpo	Caroline	Shawnee, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	767	DEIS	4(A), 7(A,G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Tolpo	Vincent	Shawnee, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	766	DEIS	2(B,C,F), 3(A,E,H), 5(B), 7(A), 16(B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Tolpo	Vincent		DEIS Public Hearing	846	DEIS	1, 7(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Ulmer	Nick	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	839	DEIS	12(D,E,G,I), 16(D,E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Wagner	Fred		DEIS Public Hearing	861	DEIS	1, 5(E), 9(B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Wagner	Tom		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5114	SDEIS	11, 23(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Waligroski	Jeanne		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5028	SDEIS	28(C)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Weaver	Bert		DEIS Public Hearing	883	DEIS	12(G)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Weaver	Bert		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5020	SDEIS	27
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Wells	Jeff	Conifer, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	762	DEIS	2(A,B), 4(A), 5(B), 12(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Wells	Jeff		DEIS Public Hearing	860	DEIS	1, 3(A,D,J), 4(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Wells	Jess		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5025	SDEIS	17, 26
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Wells	Katy	Pine, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	742	DEIS	2(C,D,E), 3(H), 12(A)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Wells	Marion	Conifer, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	763	DEIS	2(D,F), 5(A,B), 12(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Westlake	Kay	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	799	DEIS	8(E), 15(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Westling	Elizabeth		DEIS Public Hearing	852	DEIS	10(A,B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Wheelock	Eileen	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	823	DEIS	1, 2(F), 4(A), 14(B), 19(19)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Willard	I. Leroy	Idaho Springs, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	779	DEIS	7(E), 8(E), 13(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Wilson	Bill		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5035	SDEIS	23(O), 29
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Wilson	Bill		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5064	SDEIS	12(D), 22, 29
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Wilson	Katherine	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	833	DEIS	2(A), 5(E), 7(B,F)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Wilson	Kathy		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5060	SDEIS	12(D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Wilson	Kathy		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5109	SDEIS	23(V), 32
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Wilson	Kathy		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5113	SDEIS	28(E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Windemuller	Doug	Pine, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	733	DEIS	1, 2(A,D), 3(J), 4(A), 6(F), 8(C), 12(1), 15(D), 16(C), 18, (18)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Windemuller	Doug		DEIS Public Hearing	855	DEIS	2(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Woods	Johnny		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5059	SDEIS	23(T)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Woods	Julie		12/5/00 Public Hearing	5052	SDEIS	15(A), 17, 26(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Yaeger	Gary		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5016	SDEIS	2(A), 3(A), 4(E), 8
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Yarrol	Lyn		DEIS Public Hearing	848	DEIS	2(C,D,E), 7(A,B,D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Yarrol	Lyn		12/4/00 Public Hearing	5006	SDEIS	8, 23(A,J)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Yarrol	Lyn		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5073	SDEIS	3(A), 26(A), 29(B)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Yarrol	Lyn		12/6/00 Public Hearing	5087	SDEIS	23(O), 26(A)

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Yarrol	Lyn		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5097	SDEIS	23(U), 26(A,B), 28(D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Yarrol	Lyn		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5105	SDEIS	23(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Yarroll	Lyn	Conifer, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	759	DEIS	7(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Yarroll	Lyn		DEIS Public Hearing	881	DEIS	1, 2(A,B,C,D,F), 3(H), 6, 7(A,B,D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Yoensky	Ed	Denver, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	727	DEIS	2(A,B,C), 5(A), 6(B), 7, 8
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Young	Frank	Georgetown, CO	DEIS Public Hearing	801	DEIS	7(A,D,E)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Young	Frank		DEIS Public Hearing	886	DEIS	1, 7(A,D)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		Young	Mary Pat Bleesz		12/7/00 Public Hearing	5095	SDEIS	10(C), 22
III. PUBLIC HEARING		#1 unknown			12/5/00 Public Hearing	5030	SDEIS	23(Q)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		#2 unknown			12/5/00 Public Hearing	5038	SDEIS	23(A)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		#3 unknown			12/5/00 Public Hearing	5041	SDEIS	31
III. PUBLIC HEARING		#4 unknown			12/5/00 Public Hearing	5043	SDEIS	APOLOGY FOR GRANT

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
III. PUBLIC HEARING		#5 unknown			12/5/00 Public Hearing	5045	SDEIS	ALL ISSUES IMPORTANT
III. PUBLIC HEARING		#6 unknown			12/5/00 Public Hearing	5046	SDEIS	28(C)
III. PUBLIC HEARING		#7 unknown			12/5/00 Public Hearing	5047	SDEIS	23(O)
IV. PETITION		Petition #1-144 Signatures			Petition #1 – Commissioners of Park County Petition	120-139	DEIS	4(A,E), 5(A,B,E), 9(B), 16(C,D,E)
IV. PETITION		Petition #1-27 Signatures			Petition #1 – Commissioners of Park County Petition	186-191	DEIS	4(A,E), 5(A,B,E), 9(B), 16(C,D,E)
IV. PETITION		Petition #2 -48 Signatures			Petition #2 – C. Anderson Petition	192-196	DEIS	8(E), 12(A,D,E,I)
IV. PETITION		Petition #2 -53 Signatures			Petition #2 – C. Anderson Petition	262-266	DEIS	8(E), 12(A,D,E,I)
IV. PETITION		Petition #2-1169 Signatures			Petition #2 – C. Anderson Petition	630-635	DEIS	8(E), 12(A,D,E,I)
IV. PETITION		Petition #2-2022 Signatures			Petition #2 – C. Anderson Petition	273-448	DEIS	8(E), 12(A,D,E,I)
IV. PETITION		Petition #3-75 Signatures			Petition #3 – SAVE GUANELLA PASS	267-272	DEIS	2(A), 4(A), 16(A,C,D,E)
IV. PETITION		Petition #4-17 Signatures			Petition #4 – Petition with bold reasons	498	DEIS	2(A,B,C,D,F), 3(A,D), 5(A,B,E), 7(A,D)
IV. PETITION		Petition #5-5 Signatures			Petition #5 – (3rd and 4th generations)	499	DEIS	2(E), 3(G,H,J), 4(E), 7(E)
IV. PETITION		Petition #6-6 Signatures			Petition #6 – Glass Artists	629	DEIS	11

COMMENT CLASSIFICATION	AGENCY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CITY & STATE	FORM OF COMMENT	ID NUMBER	DOCUMENT	CATEGORY / SUBCATEGORY
IV. PETITION		Petition #7-61 Signatures			Petition #7 – Concerned businesses of Georgetown	636-671	DEIS	12(E,I)
IV. PETITION		Petition #8 - 613 Signatures			Petition #8 - Save Guanella Pass	5131-5181	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
IV. PETITION		Petition #8-315 Signatures			Petition #8 - Save Guanella Pass	5548-5584	SDEIS	7(G), 24(B), 26
IV. PETITION		Petition #9-426 Signatures			Petition #9	5585-5621	SDEIS	12(D,I), 29(F), 33
IV. PETITION		Petition #10-1203 Signatures			Petition #10	5622-5750	SDEIS	12(D), 17, 23(AA), 28(D,E)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Responses to DEIS COMMENTS	75
Category 1: DEIS Does Not Address All Issues.....	75
Category 2: Overuse of Guanella Pass.....	75
A. Increase in people, traffic, noise, and pollution in the area	75
B. Environmental impacts such as soil erosion and sedimentation, with additional impacts to wetlands, water quality, and the alpine tundra	76
C. Wildlife impacts such as habitat degradation, fragmentation, and impacts to threatened or endangered species	76
D. The creation of an Interstate 70 – US 285 system linkage that the infrastructure cannot handle	76
E. Encouragement of unwanted development/sprawl	76
F. Overuse by vehicles of a size and width that is excessive for this type of road	77
G. The proposed parking lot at the top of Guanella Pass to accommodate more people would be out of character	77
Category 3: Loss of Character	77
A. Major improvements ruin the beauty and present character of the area	77
B. The dwindling natural beauty and wilderness of Colorado must be protected	78
C. Improvements lessen the quality of life for residents	78
D. Desirable qualities of Guanella Pass would be forever altered	78
E. Cars will carry people over Guanella Pass too quickly to enjoy pristine environment, the recreation opportunities, and the amenities that local businesses have to offer	78
F. Dude ranches depend on existing character for business	79
G. There is a need to balance transportation with the sensitive nature of the environment	79
H. Reconstruction would impact the scenic byway designation of the roadway as well as the Historic District and landmarks	79
I. Creative ways to protect and preserve the present quality of Guanella Pass should be presented	79
J. Guanella Pass offers a place to get away from the crowds of the city or stress of everyday life and escape to the beauty of nature – improvements would impact this experience	80
Category 4: Purpose of the Project.....	80
A. The local community does not want major improvements - Georgetown residents should have a large input, in particular	80
B. The public was not informed of the project until too late in the process	80
C. The alternatives suggested in the DEIS go beyond the original intention of simply improving Guanella Pass	81
D. There is no economic link between Grant and Georgetown and the surrounding communities; therefore, no advantage of diverting Interstate 70 traffic to US 285 via Guanella Pass	81
E. The project appears to be financially motivated, developers and others who stand to gain monetarily	81
F. Public attitude has changed since the request for federal funds on Guanella Pass	81
Category 5: Safety	81
A. More accidents occur on a paved roadway	82
B. Major improvements result in increased crime, litter, road kill, rock slides, speeds, chemical spills, and non-point source pollution to the watershed	82
C. Disregard for pedestrians increases with an improved roadway	83
D. Improvements will increase speeds resulting in less safety	83
E. Improvements give a false sense of security	83
F. Negative effect on emergency services	84

Category 6: Inconsistencies in the DEIS	84
A. Accident numbers, costs, and/or lane widths are found to be inaccurate, inconsistent, or incomplete	84
B. The purpose of the project – Some commentaries believe the stated purpose of the project would have the opposite result after reconstruction. These purposes include increased safety, correction of environmental problems, and avoiding the creation of a connecting highway between Interstate 70 and US 285.	84
C. The DEIS states that a Preferred Alternative has not been identified but seems to imply a preference through suggestive descriptions and displays	85
D. The state of the existing road differs between local opinion vs. DEIS opinion	85
E. Traffic numbers – Some commentaries expressed that the traffic counts taken were inaccurate or were taken using improper methods	85
F. Coordination efforts	85
G. This subcategory is for a general comment made concerning inconsistencies in the DEIS that does not fall under a more specific category	86
Category 7: Sierra Club.....	86
A. The Sierra Club Alternative should be fully analyzed, considered, and pursued	86
B. FHWA guidelines for reconstruction should be adapted to maintain the rustic nature of the roadway	86
C. The FHWA manual has 2 categories that can be applied to a road for maintenance: Rehabilitation and Reconstruction – rehabilitation has not been considered	87
D. The Sierra Club Alternative provides a sensible solution to preserve the beauty and rustic character of the area	87
E. If the Sierra Club proposal is eliminated, then prefer Alternative 1: No-Action	87
F. The Build Alternatives create a roadway that is too wide, with too much cut slope, too many retaining walls, unnecessary shoulders, etc. – the Sierra Club Alternative stays within the current footprint	88
G. Don't want road reconstructed, just stabilized as in the Sierra Club Alternative	88
Category 8: Alternative 1 - No Action	88
A. If reconstructed, unspoiled wilderness areas are more difficult to access	89
B. Existing road serves its purpose for the area it transverses	89
C. Roads like Guanella Pass are an adventure and limit traffic by their nature	89
D. Negative impacts outweigh any advantages of improvements	89
E. Against improving and/or widening	89
F. The area can't handle impacts associated with increased use, such as increased amounts of traffic, equipment, costs for maintenance, and the need for increased emergency services	89
G. Guanella Pass should remain a rustic/scenic roadway	90
Category 9: Overall Cost.....	91
A. The difference in costs between paving, not paving, and minor improvements is substantial	91
B. Park and Clear Creek Counties and the taxpayers will end up paying for long-term maintenance, increased patrols, and litter pick-up	91
C. Spend this money on other projects, such as: US 285 (most frequently mentioned), Interstate 70, Hwy 9 to Breckenridge, Bear Creek, or a skyway from Denver to Vail	92
D. Costs to Clear Creek and Park Counties due to damages brought forward by local businesses	92
E. Counties are currently unable to keep up with maintenance costs of paved portions on Guanella Pass Road; therefore, they would not be able to maintain the costs of the road if fully paved	92
F. Paving and widening is an overly expensive alternative	93
Category 10: Benefits of Improving Guanella Pass Road.....	93
A. Reconstruction will save Guanella Pass from dust and runoff impacts; as well as reduce maintenance costs; increase safety; and decrease unauthorized camping, parking, and social trails	93
B. Improvements will ensure future maintainability for the roadway	93
C. Positive economic impacts	93

Category 11: Use the Federal Money for Major Improvements to Guanella Pass Road	93
A. Park and Clear Creek Counties have limited resources to rehabilitate the road	94
B. Paving the road would be beneficial to correct the current problems	94
C. The road could become inaccessible due to dangerous driving conditions – the road is in need of improvements for future maintainability	94
Category 12: Minimal Improvements	94
A. In favor of minimal repairs	94
B. Major maintenance would be too costly	94
C. Minor repairs should be supported by federal funds through county maintenance activities	95
D. Modest improvements including one or more of the following: safety, drainage, sedimentation, and/or recreational use improvements	95
E. No widening beyond what exists now, i.e., do not widen to FHWA standards	95
F. Do not pave on the Park County side of Guanella Pass/beyond Geneva Park	95
G. Provide regular maintenance	95
H. Improve, but do not pave or change the footprint of the roadway	96
I. Pursue rehabilitation	96
Category 13: Issues with the Guanella Pass Public Hearings	96
A. Not a true public hearing because it did not facilitate discussion	96
B. The open house format limited debate – interested in learning other people’s thoughts about the pros and cons of the project	96
Category 14: Recreational safety considerations	97
A. Need to improve hiking/biking trails and provide a shoulder wide enough to accommodate bicyclists	97
B. Put in emergency phones for recreationalists	97
C. Include American Discovery Trail on Guanella Pass Road	97
Category 15: Negative impacts on local economies	97
A. Bypassing Georgetown adversely affects business owners by taking away business	97
B. Impacts within Georgetown – the additional traffic through Georgetown creates more business, employees are difficult to find, inadequate parking, and congestion	98
C. Businesses (such as Tumbling River Ranch) will assert substantial monetary claims for compensation and damages	98
D. Many local businesses contribute substantially to the economy (Tumbling River Ranch) – if these businesses fold due to construction, the impact would be significant to the economy	98
Category 16: Construction Impacts	98
A. Wildlife would be negatively impacted by the noise, trucks, and habitat disturbance	99
B. The environment would be impacted due to construction runoff, noxious weed introduction, and the removal of native species	99
C. The local economy would be affected because visitors will avoid the construction area	99
D. The local traffic will be congested due to construction delays as well as by the large trucks and equipment	100
E. A time frame of seven to ten years is too long and will place undue stress on the area	100
Category 17: DEIS Alternative #1	100
Category 18: DEIS Alternative #2	100

Category 19: DEIS Alternative #3	100
Category 20: DEIS Alternative #4	100
Category 21: DEIS Alternative #5	100
Category 22: SDEIS Alternative #6.....	100
Responses to SDEIS COMMENTS	101
Category 23: SDEIS Issues Need To Be Elaborated.....	101
A. Sedimentation issues	101
B. Impacts to local businesses	101
C. Number of construction trucks on road	101
D. Clarification of construction period	101
E. Cost of maintenance	102
F. Impacts to Georgetown	102
G. Traffic numbers	102
H. Traffic on US 285	102
I. Character issues of road	102
J. Impacts to wildlife	102
K. Pedestrian/bike/equestrian issues	103
L. No mitigation for people affected by construction	103
M. No litigation for easements and ROW	103
N. Traffic during construction	103
O. Changes that may occur in design	103
P. Vibrations due to construction	104
Q. Difference between light reconstruction and rehabilitation	104
R. Economic impact determination	104
S. Vague language	104
T. Air quality	104
U. Environmental issues	104
V. Community involvement	105
W. Visual impacts	105
Y. School children impacts	105
Z. Quality of life	105
AA.Revegetation	105
Category 24: Problems with the SDEIS	105
A. Design vehicle too big	106
B. Not representative of public's wishes	106
C. Does not address environmental concerns	106
D. Time table for construction	106
Category 25: No Guarantee that Guanella Pass Will Not Continue to Change	106
Category 26: Oppose SDEIS Alternative	107
A. Alternative 6 is not enough of a compromise	107
B. Not enough problems solved by Alternative 6	107

Category 27: Comment Previously Addressed (Public Hearing)	107
Category 28: Concerns with Construction	107
A. Construction impacts on wildlife	107
B. Construction truck traffic	108
C. Construction of retaining walls	108
D. Road surface damage from construction vehicles	108
E. Road location	108
F. Construction impacts on the environment	108
G. Pedestrian/horse/bike safety during construction	108
H. Construction impacts on the economy	109
Category 29: Want Another Alternative	109
A. Winter closure	109
B. Road closure	109
C. Pursue other options for financing road improvements	109
D. Control access	109
E. Bypass Georgetown	110
F. Rehabilitation	110
Category 30: How Is the Final Decision Made.....	110
Category 31: FHWA Money Can Be Used Elsewhere	110
Category 32: Too Much Money Spent on this Project.....	111
Category 33: Oppose All FHWA Alternatives	111
Category 34: Request for Comment Period Extension	111
Category 35: Only Acceptable Alternative Must Include Specific Items	111
A. Original road area must remain in its current limits of disturbance	111
B. No heavy construction, blasting, or construction materials hauling should be permitted up either side of the Pass	112
C. The project should only focus on repairing the existing surface type and fixing drainage and erosion problems	112
D. The project should only be classified as a rehabilitation project	112
E. Any damage to private property owners in both Park County and Clear Creek County should be compensated by the Federal Highway Administration	112
FORM LETTERS.....	112
Form Letter #1.....	112
A. Oppose Alternative 6	112
B. Oppose all FHWA Alternatives	112
C. Alternative 6 does not respond to previous comments	113
D. Only acceptable alternative will include:	113

Form Letter #2.....	113
A. Greatly concerned about construction impacts (truck traffic, construction duration, economy, vibration, air quality, noise, quality of life)	113
B. Want rehabilitation to be the newly developed alternative	115
C. Do not accept Alternative 6	115
Form Letter #3.....	115
A. Need “now” solution to a “now” problem, i.e., the issues have changed since the project’s inception and these new issues need to be addressed	115
B. Alternative 1 doesn’t solve all problems but it does preserve existing conditions	115
C. Issues related to project	115
Form Letter #4.....	117
A. Need “now” solution to a “now” problem, i.e., the issues have changed since the project’s inception and these new issues need to be addressed	117
B. Issues related to project	117
C. Alternative 1 doesn’t solve all problems but it does preserve existing conditions	118
Form Letter #5.....	118
A. Construction affects quality of life	118
B. SDEIS does not thoroughly address safety issues and construction impacts	118
C. Trade-off of getting road work done isn’t worth ruining environment	119
D. Do not accept Alternative 6; want minimum rehabilitation instead	119
Form Letter #6.....	119
A. Opposition to Alternative 6	119
B. Alternative 6 will destroy the scenic, aesthetic, rural, and rustic nature of the area	119
C. The only acceptable alternative must consist of:	119
Petition #1	120
A. Opposition to Alternative 6	120
B. Oppose all FHWA alternatives	120
C. The only acceptable alternative must consist of:	120
Petition #2	120
Petition #3 – “Save Guanella Pass”	121
A. The project funding was first approved ten years ago	121
B. The public does not want the project	121
C. The Commissioners have had adequate time to study the issue	121
D. \$50 million budget is for ten years of heavy construction and road closure, triple the traffic and increased traffic speeds, increased accidents and injuries, destruction of wildlife habitat, and \$5 million cost to the County and endless lawsuits	121
Petition #4	122
A. Takes away the rustic and primitive character of the road and its surrounding areas	122
B. Inappropriate use of Guanella Pass Road would be encouraged	123
C. Serious destructive impacts on wildlife	123

D. Up to nine acres of wetlands would be destroyed	123
E. Noise	123
F. Paving and widening the Guanella Pass Road does not equal a safer road	123
Petition #5	123
A. Improving not in best long-range interests of Clear Creek County	124
B. Need to say no to rapid sprawl	124
C. Few historic towns remaining	124
D. Too much- too soon development will make us lose mountains	124
E. We are becoming “Californicated”	125
F. Won’t know what we have until it’s gone	125
Petition #6	125
A. People are inspired by the beauty of the mountains and require safe travel	125
B. Guanella Pass is very dangerous	125
C. Improving/paving will make the drive more comfortable and safer for everyone	125
Petition #7	125
Petition #8	125
A. Opposition to Alternative 6	125
B. Oppose all FHWA alternatives	126
C. The only acceptable alternative must consist of:	126
Petition #9	126
Petition #10	126
A. Eliminate all full reconstruction and realignment	126
B. Retain the roadway slope, neighboring slopes, and old growth	127
C. Use natural materials on accompanying road structures and leave the unpaved surfaces unpaved	127
D. Focus only on repairing existing surface type and fixing drainage and erosion problems	127
E. Construction impacts on communities and the Guanella Pass Road area must be very limited	127
F. If changes to the design cannot be limited to maintenance improvements to the existing road surface, then we would like the FHWA to choose Alternative 1	127

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Responses to DEIS COMMENTS

Category 1: DEIS Does Not Address All Issues

This category was established to represent the overall comment that the DEIS either did not address all issues or did not address them adequately. As a result, the SDEIS was developed to provide an additional alternative that would provide an acceptable build alternative that would have a lesser impact upon the environment and affected community. Specific commentaries as they relate to the DEIS and subsequent SDEIS follow in categories 2 through 35.

Category 2: Overuse of Guanella Pass

This category refers to the overuse of Guanella Pass that results from any major improvements. The improvements would bring more activity to the Guanella Pass area, creating a situation of overuse. This overuse leads to the impacts in the subcategories listed below:

A. Increase in people, traffic, noise, and pollution in the area

People and traffic

Under Alternative 1, traffic volumes are projected to increase 56 percent by the year 2025 over 1995 traffic volumes. Alternative 6 was developed in response to concerns related to reducing the rate of growth in traffic and noise volumes for the project. Traffic volumes under Alternative 6 are projected to increase an additional 20 percent at the summit over Alternative 1, which is considerably less than the build alternatives 2-5. For further information see **Section III.B.1b**.

Noise

A noise analysis was conducted for the Guanella Pass Road improvement project. The existing condition, Alternative 1, and all build alternatives (Alternatives 2-6) were analyzed.

Based on the noise analysis, none of the alternatives produce substantial traffic noise impacts. State transportation agencies do not implement mitigation measures for changes in noise levels of less than 10 to 15 dBA. None of the areas analyzed were projected to experience more than a 3-dBA increase with future traffic projections. It should be noted that along Loop Drive, noise levels are produced primarily by traffic on Interstate 70 and not Guanella Pass Road. No substantial benefit is derived from mitigation of local traffic noise produced by the project. For further information see **Section III.C.2**.

Air Pollution

The proposed project is located in an area designated as “attainment by the EPA. As a result, pollution in the area from vehicle emissions would increase in proportion to the traffic increase, but would still not pose any threat to wildlife populations, vegetation, or human populations. For further information see **Section III.C.1**.

B. Environmental impacts such as soil erosion and sedimentation, with additional impacts to wetlands, water quality, and the alpine tundra

Alternative 6 will improve the existing conditions that degrade the water quality, such as eroding roadway ditches, shoulders, and embankments. The use of best management practices (BMP's) during and after construction and an aggressive revegetation program are expected to improve the conditions for water quality. Alternative surface types create a harder surface than reconstructed gravel, which may provide more opportunity for erosion control and reduced sedimentation runoff.

In addition to improvements made to drainage structures, ditches, and sediment control structures, improvements such as earth berms and boulders adjacent to the road will control off-road access or dispersed access to public lands along the road. Controlling this access will reduce impacts to sensitive areas near the road. For further information see **Section III.B.2a, III.B.2b, and IV.I.3.**

C. Wildlife impacts such as habitat degradation, fragmentation, and impacts to threatened or endangered species

Alternative 6 has a lower design criteria than any of the DEIS build alternatives. This includes a narrower roadway and reduced design speed, resulting in reduced impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat. Road improvements such as the use of guardrail, designated pullouts, and defined parking areas will control off-road access or dispersed access to public lands along the road, which could be a benefit to wildlife.

Winter closure (to be decided by local agencies) could also result in beneficial reduction of potential impacts to wildlife in the Guanella Pass area. For further information see **Section III.B.5.**

D. The creation of an Interstate 70 – US 285 system linkage that the infrastructure cannot handle

Proposed improvements under Alternative 6 are not designed to encourage the use of Guanella Pass Road as a connector between I-70 and US 285. The classification of Guanella Pass Road as a rural local road allows the use of lower design criteria such as lower design speed and sharper curvature, which make the route less attractive for through traffic.

Management responsibilities for maintaining the use of the roadway as a rural local road fall under local agencies, including discouragement of an increase in through traffic. These responsibilities may include the possible use of size limits or seasonal travel restrictions. For further information see **Section II.D.4a-b, and II.D.6.**

E. Encouragement of unwanted development/sprawl

As stated in the DEIS, improving Guanella Pass Road is not expected to substantially increase the population of Georgetown, Clear Creek County, or Park County above the current projections. Only a small proportion of land along Guanella Pass Road is privately owned. Most of the land is owned by the Federal Government and administered by the FS. Historic Georgetown or the Historic District Public Lands Commission holds much of the private land near Georgetown and the

Georgetown Reservoir for the purpose of protecting it from development. As a result, improving the road will cause little additional development in the corridor.

Future development, either commercial or residential, would be regulated by the land management agencies to reflect a rural local road functional classification.

Potential secondary impacts to land use include increased tourist-oriented and recreation development. However, because Georgetown and Silver Plume are in historic districts, some controls are in effect to determine the style and type of development or redevelopment that may occur within these towns (such as the zoning restrictions passed in the fall of 2001). For further information see **Sections III.B.1c, III.B.1e, and III.B.1f.**

F. Overuse by vehicles of a size and width that is excessive for this type of road

Alternative 6 proposes a decreased vehicle size as compared to the DEIS build alternatives (17 feet vs. 20 feet). Roadway use restrictions may be implemented by local agencies that would regulate the size of vehicles using the road. For further information see **Section II.D.4c.**

G. The proposed parking lot at the top of Guanella Pass to accommodate more people would be out of character

Locations of pullouts and parking areas will be consistent with FS Visual Quality Objectives in areas that were determined to be necessary for the protection of FS area resources.

Proposed parking at the top of Guanella Pass has been revised since the DEIS. The proposed parking is anticipated to accommodate approximately 100 vehicles, which is less than proposed in the DEIS and is currently less than the number of vehicles that park there on the weekend (estimated 175 vehicles). Roadway designs will discourage vehicles from pulling off the road. The proposed parking at the summit does not meet the projected year 2025 demand and assumes that designated parking and/or a Wilderness Use Permit will limit use of the area. For further information see **Section II.E.1, III.B.3.**

Category 3: Loss of Character

This category addresses issues raised concerning the rustic character that commenters believe would be lost in the Guanella Pass area with any major improvements to the roadway. Subcategories range from the loss of visual character to the emotional impacts that reconstruction would have on local residents as well as to visitors in the area. The subcategories related to this loss of character are as follows:

A. Major improvements ruin the beauty and present character of the area

Alternative 6 was developed specifically to minimize the impact of the project on the character of the road. New design criteria allow a narrower road with slower speeds and fewer areas of full reconstruction, allowing a more rustic and scenic roadway setting. The change in community character is to some extent proportional to the increase in traffic volume. Impacts to the character of the community under Alternative 6 would be less than for the DEIS build alternatives due to lower traffic volume.

Improvements under Alternative 6 also have less visual impact to the surrounding area. This alternative is intended to better retain the visual quality and character of the road than the other DESI build alternatives, resulting in a more rustic and scenic roadway setting. Based on the road character elements defined in **Table III-12** of the FEIS, Alternative 6 is the most consistent of all alternatives in keeping with the existing character of the road.

Alternative surface types were evaluated which would help preserve the character of the road. Other design considerations included retaining walls, slope treatments and revegetation, and guardrail design and materials that are visually in keeping with the rural character of the road. For further information see **Section III.B.1a, III.B.3**

B. The dwindling natural beauty and wilderness of Colorado must be protected

The scenic quality of the road will actually be enhanced by improvements under Alternative 6 such as revegetation of cut slopes up to the edge of the road (currently, poor surface conditions prevent vegetation from growing to the edge of the road). For further information see **Section III.B.3**.

C. Improvements lessen the quality of life for residents

Traffic forecasts for each of the alternatives show that Alternative 6 will have the least traffic impact of all build alternatives, with minimal change in the quality of life for residents and the community character. Construction schedules and haul routes will be designed to minimize impacts to area residents and visitors. For further information see **Section III.B.1a-d**.

D. Desirable qualities of Guanella Pass would be forever altered

Alternative 6 was presented after the public commented on the DEIS build alternatives. Compared to other build alternatives, Alternative 6 minimizes changes in desirable qualities of the road, and better preserves the existing beauty and character of the road by providing a more environmentally and aesthetically sensitive alternative through reduced design criteria.

Improvements that are found in Alternative 6 are designed to enhance the scenic qualities of Guanella Pass and increase environmental protection. Some of these measures include the revegetation of unstable slopes, improvements to roadway drainage, reduction in road surface sedimentation, and the addition of designated pullouts and relocation of parking areas to restrict access to environmentally sensitive areas. For further information see **Sections III.B.1a and III.B.3**.

E. Cars will carry people over Guanella Pass too quickly to enjoy pristine environment, the recreation opportunities, and the amenities that local businesses have to offer

The design speed of Alternative 6 varies between 20 to 30 mph - 6 mph less than the DEIS build alternatives. The lower design speed and curvilinear alignment of the roadway will discourage vehicles from traveling at excessive speeds, accommodating a more leisurely pace. For further information see **Section II.D.4b**.

F. Dude ranches depend on existing character for business

Alternative 6 was developed in response to concerns about a loss of character for the road. Alternative 6 includes a narrower roadway with more rehabilitation and light reconstruction sections than the DEIS Alternatives. Alternative 6 was developed to better preserve the rustic and rural character of the existing road. Limitation of hauling and construction activities in the vicinity of the dude ranch will minimize impacts on the existing character and business. For further information see **Sections III.B.1d and IV.I.**

G. There is a need to balance transportation with the sensitive nature of the environment

FHWA believes Alternative 6 strikes a balance between transportation needs and minimizing impacts to the environment by reconstructing only selected portions of the corridor that are in greatest need of transportation improvements, while retaining the existing roadway characteristics in most locations.

H. Reconstruction would impact the scenic byway designation of the roadway as well as the Historic District and landmarks

Based on the information presented in the Corridor Management Strategy (CMS), the Scenic Byway Committee supports improvements to Guanella Pass Road to preserve the Scenic Byway. The CMS also supports the improvements to the roadway as a means of stabilizing and enhancing the roadway and the beauty of the area. Visitor use of the Guanella Pass area continues to increase, making it difficult for the FS to manage. The FS believes that the proposed improvements will aid in their ability to manage the area by restricting off-road access to sensitive areas.

Alternative 6 is anticipated to have less traffic and requires less construction hauling within the Historic Landmark District than the DEIS build alternatives. The narrower roadway width and reduced curve radii in the Georgetown area reduce the visual impact to Leavenworth Mountain and the Historic District.

Improvements such as retaining walls, careful blasting techniques, rock-cut stain, and revegetation will be used to minimize visual impacts to Section 4(f) Resources. Additionally, architectural treatments will be incorporated into the retaining wall design to reflect the backdrop and character of the historic district. Neither the State Historic Preservation Officer nor the National Park Service, which oversees projects in the National Landmark Districts have indicated that the project would adversely effect the Historic Landmark Status of the Historic District of Georgetown. For further information see **Section III.B.1g, III.B.3, and IV.A.**

I. Creative ways to protect and preserve the present quality of Guanella Pass should be presented

During the development of Alternative 6, flexibility and creativity was exercised in the selection of design criteria and solutions that required less reconstruction. These criteria and solutions also allowed more rehabilitation work, a narrower roadway, a slower design speed, tighter curve radii,

smaller design vehicles, and reduced traffic volume. In addition, surfacing alternatives were tested as a creative alternative to traditional gravel and paving methods.

J. Guanella Pass offers a place to get away from the crowds of the city or stress of everyday life and escape to the beauty of nature – improvements would impact this experience

Alternative 6 accommodates current uses of the corridor, and will better preserve the existing beauty and character of the road by providing a more environmentally and aesthetically sensitive alternative. In addition, proposed improvements are in compliance with the FS Visual Quality Objectives.

Proposed improvements under Alternative 6 such as the revegetation of unstable slopes and alternative surface types will serve to enhance the visual character of Guanella Pass. For further information see **Sections III.B.1b and III.B.3.**

Category 4: Purpose of the Project

This category of comments addresses conflicts with the purpose of the project. Many comments expressed that the purpose does not reflect the voice of the majority. The subcategories concerning the purpose of the project are as follows:

A. The local community does not want major improvements - Georgetown residents should have a large input, in particular

The Town of Georgetown, through Town officials and public meetings, has been involved in the development of this project since its inception.

FHWA recognizes that the majority of commenters do not wish to have major improvements made to Guanella Pass. Based on public and agency comments on the DEIS build alternatives, Alternative 6 was created to provide improvements that involve more rehabilitation of the road and less reconstruction. Improvements under Alternative 6 were developed to create less of an impact on the visual and natural setting, as well as the local communities. For further information see **Section I.B.1.**

B. The public was not informed of the project until too late in the process

The development of the project began approximately 15 years ago, when Clear Creek County officials began seeking federal funding assistance for improving the road's condition and began attending the annual Forest Highway Program meetings in 1987. Park County became involved in 1990. Through those meetings the two counties requested that the Guanella Pass Road receive consideration for improvements under the Forest Highway Program.

The FHWA Reconnaissance and Scoping Report was completed in 1993. After the report was prepared and reviewed with other government agencies, public scoping meetings regarding the proposed project were held in early 1994 prior to the development of any preliminary design for the road. The fact that FHWA developed a new alternative, Alternative 6, in response to public comments demonstrates that public comment received during the DEIS comment period was not "too late". For further information see **Section I.B.1 and Chapter III.**

C. The alternatives suggested in the DEIS go beyond the original intention of simply improving Guanella Pass

Due to the severely degraded nature of the road, any improvement intended to last for a lengthy period of time may seem excessive. Existing and projected use and the poor condition of the road do not permit FHWA engineers, in good conscience, to propose anything less than Alternative 6. Alternative 6 was developed to reduce the amount of paving and reconstruction from that which was proposed for the DEIS alternatives. Alternative 6 is intended to be more responsive than the DEIS build alternatives to public concerns regarding the environmental setting and the rustic and rural character of the road. For further information see **Sections I.B.1 and I.C.**

D. There is no economic link between Grant and Georgetown and the surrounding communities; therefore, no advantage of diverting Interstate 70 traffic to US 285 via Guanella Pass

Alternative 6 recognizes that Guanella Pass is not meant to be a commercial link or through route between Interstate 70 and US 285. The primary purpose of Guanella Pass Road is, and will continue to be, to provide recreational access to the forests and access to the developments provided by the FS such as camping, picnicking, etc. Alternative 6 emphasizes this by giving the road a “rural road” classification. For further information see **Section I.C.1d.**

E. The project appears to be financially motivated, i.e., developers and others who stand to gain monetarily

The development of the project began approximately 15 years ago, when Clear Creek County officials began seeking federal funding assistance for improving the road’s condition and began attending the annual Forest Highway Program meetings in 1987 (Park County became involved in the process in 1990). Through those meetings Clear Creek County requested that the Guanella Pass Road receive consideration for improvements under the Forest Highway Program.

The Program Agencies (FHWA, FS, and CDOT) chose Guanella Pass Road for federal funding because the route serves both the national forests and the State or Counties and has a great need for improvement. The very limited amount of privately owned land within the project corridor prevents any dramatic increase in development of the area. For further information see **Section I.B.1.**

F. Public attitude has changed since the request for federal funds on Guanella Pass

Public input was received and utilized during scoping and development of the DEIS. Public meetings were held after the release of the DEIS. Public comments received on the DEIS identified a need to develop a new alternative. Alternative 6 was developed to provide an alternative that is more responsive than the DEIS build alternatives to the current public attitude regarding the project. For further information see **Section I.B.**

Category 5: Safety

This category describes commentaries relative to safety issues regarding the proposed reconstruction. The subcategories describe the safety problems anticipated from any major

improvements to the roadway. The following are the subcategories relating to the increase in safety issues caused by reconstruction:

A. More accidents occur on a paved roadway

Accident rates on Guanella Pass Road are notably higher than the accident rates on similar hard-surface recreational roads. Many safety deficiencies on the existing roadway create a high accident potential. The hazards created by these safety deficiencies will become an increasing problem on the existing road as traffic volumes increase over time. With a paved road, although traffic will be traveling at slightly increased speeds in a more open corridor, improved road surface and geometry will offset this hazard potential and increased stopping sight distance and better vehicle handling will result. For further information see **Section I.C.1c**.

B. Major improvements result in increased crime, litter, road kill, rock slides, speeds, chemical spills, and non-point source pollution to the watershed

Crime

Due to the wide variety of factors affecting crime rates, there is no way to predict whether there would be an increased level of crime resulting from the roadway improvement project. Information is not available on this subject as the connection between roadway improvements and increased crime has not been determined.

Wildlife

The magnitude of potential adverse impacts of an improved road on fish and wildlife in the affected area will be dependent upon the changes in the traffic volume and speed of vehicles that travel the road in comparison to current conditions. Long-term increases in vehicle-wildlife accidents are anticipated under all of the alternatives as a direct result of increased traffic volumes above current conditions. Road kill may result in local decrease wildlife abundance. Potential adverse effects of the build alternative on wildlife would be greatest under Alternatives 2 and 3, somewhat reduced in magnitude under Alternatives 4 and 5, and of lowest magnitude under Alternative 6. For further information see **Section III.B.5**.

Rock slides

Alternative 6 provides improved rockfall protection over the existing rockfall ditches and reduction of roadside hazards. It also has the least amount of full reconstruction of all build alternatives, minimizing the potential for affecting unstable materials. For further information see **Section I.C.2b**.

Speeds

The design speed under Alternative 6 is 20 to 30 mph. This is 5 to 10 mph less than the 25 to 40 mph design speed for Alternatives 2-5. This reduction in design speed allows a curvilinear alignment that more closely follows the existing roadway. This sharp curvature in combination with a narrower roadway width discourages vehicles from speeding on the road. For further information see **Section II.D.4b**.

Chemical spills

Alternative 6 proposes a shorter vehicle length than Alternatives 2-5 (17 feet vs. 20 feet), allowing a road design that more closely follows the existing roadway. The shorter design vehicle would limit increased use by oversize vehicles (especially commercial vehicles and large trucks) from using this roadway as a system linkage between I-70 and US 285. Trucks that would typically be used for hauling loads such as chemicals would exceed this length. For further information see **Section II.D.4c**.

Non-point source pollution

Guanella Pass Road is currently a non-point source of pollution to the surrounding water sources. The proposed improvements under Alternative 6 will lessen the existing impact of the roadway to water quality in the area.

In regard to construction activities, the contractor will be required to comply with all local, state, and national water quality standards and regulations for construction activities. NPDES permits and certification must be acquired from the state prior to construction. Pullouts, camping, picnicking, and recreational areas designated by the FS will discourage public use in undesired and/or sensitive areas, reducing impacts such as litter and other forms of pollution to these sensitive areas. For further information see **Sections III.B.2, III.B.6a, and IV.I.3**.

C. Disregard for pedestrians increases with an improved roadway

The proposed improvements for Alternative 6 include a two-foot wide shoulder. In addition, some of the most dangerous existing tight curves are reconstructed with more gradual curves, reducing the number of blind spots and improving sight distances. Although traffic will be traveling at slightly increased speeds in a more open corridor, this hazard potential will be offset by roadside safety improvements such as, increased stopping sight distance, and better vehicle handling because of the improved road surface and geometry. FHWA had considered implementing a wider shoulder and separate foot/bike path. However, these options were eliminated due to the increase in impacts the construction of these facilities would have on the environment. For further information see **Section III.B.4c**.

D. Improvements will increase speeds resulting in less safety

The design speed under Alternative 6 is 30 to 50 km/h (20 to 30 mph). This is at least 10 km/h (6 mph) less than the 40 to 60 km/h (25 to 40 mph) design speed for Alternatives 2-5. The change in design speed allows a curvilinear alignment that more closely follows the existing roadway. This sharp curvature in combination with a narrow roadway width makes it difficult for vehicles to achieve high speed on the road. Also, improvements such as the addition of guardrails and a consistent roadway width provide less chance for a vehicle to roll over the edge of the roadway where steep drop-offs occur. For further information see **Section II.D.4b**.

E. Improvements give a false sense of security

Alternative 6 improves the safety of the roadway by providing increased rockfall protection, consistent geometry, increased sight distances, increased guardrail, and vehicle pullouts.

In addition to the improved safety of the roadway, the low design speed and curvilinear alignment of the road will discourage vehicles from traveling at excessive speeds. For further information see **Section III.E.2.**

F. Negative effect on emergency services

Under Alternative 1 (No-Action), calls for emergency services could reasonably be expected to increase proportionally to the amount of increased traffic. Given this assumption, the emergency service calls could be expected to increase by 56 percent. Alternative 6 will have the least impact of the build alternatives, increasing the number of calls an additional 20 percent over the Alternative 1. For further information see **Section III.C.10.**

Category 6: Inconsistencies in the DEIS

This category addresses inconsistencies in the DEIS identified by commentaries. These are issues that the commentaries argue do not make sense within the DEIS, or they have other information to prove otherwise. The subcategories addressing inconsistencies in the DEIS are as follows:

A. Accident numbers, costs, and/or lane widths are found to be inaccurate, inconsistent, or incomplete

Accident numbers are those reported on Guanella Pass Road and were obtained from public records.

Construction costs are reported as conceptual comparison costs. These costs are based on preliminary design and may change during final design. These costs should be used for comparison purposes only. Future maintenance costs assume that the proposed road surfaces are maintained to a level consistent with standard recommended practices, preferred surface conditions, and projected traffic volumes. As with any costs that have been developed for the purposes of this document, the maintenance costs are intended to give a relative comparison between alternatives and are not intended for county or city budget planning. The maintenance costs are developed with assumptions that may or may not be an accurate representation of actual maintenance activities.

Information on lane widths was obtained by review of public records and through interviews with agencies responsible for maintenance. For further information see **Section I.C.1c, III.B.6b, and III.C.11.**

B. The purpose of the project – Some commentaries believe the stated purpose of the project would have the opposite result after reconstruction. These purposes include increased safety, correction of environmental problems, and avoiding the creation of a connecting highway between Interstate 70 and US 285.

Alternative 6 was developed to address concerns that Alternatives 2-5 would worsen some of the problems that they were intended to address, such as those mentioned above. Alternative 6 addresses some of these concerns by a change in the functional classification of the roadway from a rural collector road to a rural local road. The change in functional classification allows a lower design speed with sharper roadway curves and a narrower roadway width than what was originally proposed in the DEIS. Each of these changes in the design criteria permits Alternative 6 to follow more closely the existing roadway. These changes discourage excessive speeds (a safety concern), environmental problems (less disruption to the environment occurs because of the narrower

roadway width), and the creation of a connecting highway (commercial and/or large vehicles would be discouraged from using the road). For further information see **Section II.B.6**.

C. The DEIS states that a Preferred Alternative has not been identified but seems to imply a preference through suggestive descriptions and displays

The Preferred Alternative was not identified in the DEIS. Any implication of a preference for a particular alternative was unintentional, as the Preferred Alternative was developed after public comments were received on both the DEIS and the SDEIS.

D. The state of the existing road differs between local opinion vs. DEIS opinion

Professional Engineers in the State of Colorado assessed the state of the existing road. The substandard roadway surface conditions were determined in relation to the current and projected traffic volumes on the road. The existing roadway surface is not strong enough to carry current traffic volume loads, and further deterioration will occur if the roadway is not improved. For further information see **Section II.B.1**.

E. Traffic numbers – Some commentaries expressed that the traffic counts taken were inaccurate or were taken using improper methods

The traffic volume information presented in the DEIS, the SDEIS, and the FEIS are based on traffic studies completed between August of 1994 and August of 1995. A detailed analysis of traffic volume information is provided in *Guanella Pass Road Traffic Study, Technical Memorandum, Traffic Volume Projections* (MK Centennial, September 29, 2001).. The information-gathering methods presented in this technical memorandum as well as in the SDEIS are based on accepted engineering techniques and standards.

F. Coordination efforts

1) FHWA has stated that they have had several interactions with local and state agencies, but this is not the case

The development of the project began approximately 15 years ago, when Clear Creek County officials began seeking federal funding assistance for improving the road's condition and began attending the annual Forest Highway Program meetings in 1987 (Park County became involved in the process in 1990). Through those meetings the two counties requested that the Guanella Pass Road receive consideration for improvements under the Forest Highway Program.

Although federal funds are used for the projects, the maintenance and control of the roads and the joint approval of the project details remain with the State or local entity having jurisdiction – in this case Clear Creek County, Park County, and the Town of Georgetown. The Town of Georgetown has been involved in the development of this project since its inception. All coordination events are listed in Chapter VII. For further information see **Section I.B.1 and Chapter VII**.

2) FHWA should be more receptive of public opinion

Alternative 6 was developed based on public comments received on the DEIS. The new alternative was developed by the FHWA in cooperation with Clear Creek County, the Town of Georgetown, Park County, the FS, and the CDOT. These agencies participated in numerous work group sessions to coordinate a response to public comments and develop a new alternative for public consideration. These work group sessions were held from early February through early May 2000 and were open to the public for observation. For further information see **Sections I.B.1-4.**

G. This subcategory is for a general comment made concerning inconsistencies in the DEIS that does not fall under a more specific category

This comment has been noted and will be considered as part of the official documentation for this project.

Category 7: Sierra Club

This category describes comments made that stress the need for repair or maintenance for the road, but not to the extent proposed by the build alternatives. These commentaries expressed that Alternatives 2-5 are above and beyond what the roadway needs, but that “No-Action” will not solve the problems that exist. The comments made may range from a suggestion for rehabilitation to no pavement beyond Geneva Park. These commentaries are in favor of the Sierra Club Alternative and the subcategories are as follows:

A. The Sierra Club Alternative should be fully analyzed, considered, and pursued

The Sierra Club Alternative was initially considered and then eliminated from detailed analysis. The Sierra Club Alternative may appear to be adequate for current traffic, but it does not provide for the increases in traffic expected in 20 years. It is not considered a wise investment of public funds to expend limited resources on improvements that soon will become inadequate or inappropriate. The most hazardous conditions are left unaddressed and may leave the Counties, the FS, and the FHWA with a facility having many operational, maintenance, and safety liabilities.

Many of the environmental enhancements recommended as part of this alternative are included in Alternative 6. Alternative 6 provides the closest solution to the Sierra Club Alternative concerns while addressing much needed operational, maintenance, and safety concerns. If FHWA were obligated to select between the Sierra Club Alternative and the No-Action Alternative (Alternative 1), FHWA’s stewardship responsibilities would require it to select Alternative 1. These responsibilities are described in the Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) at 23 CFR Part 625.2 which states that “Plans and specifications . . . shall provide for a facility that will (1) Adequately serve the existing and planned future traffic of the highway in a manner that is conducive to safety, durability and economy of maintenance . . .” For further information see **Section II.F.8.**

B. FHWA guidelines for reconstruction should be adapted to maintain the rustic nature of the roadway

After the release of the DEIS, many commentaries on the document expressed concern over the level of reconstruction proposed in the build alternatives, including widening the roadway,

increasing the design speed, and realignment of sharp curves. The FHWA responded by creating Alternative 6, which changes the functional classification of the roadway to a rural local road. This classification is consistent with a lower design speed with sharper roadway curves, a narrower roadway width, and a smaller design vehicle than the DEIS build alternatives.

Alternative 6 is a compromise between the environmental and aesthetic concerns, while reducing maintenance for counties and improving the safety for the traveling public to an acceptable level. For further information see **Section I.B.4**.

**C. The FHWA manual has 2 categories that can be applied to a road for maintenance:
Rehabilitation and Reconstruction – rehabilitation has not been considered**

Rehabilitation of the road was considered but eliminated because it leaves the most hazardous conditions unaddressed and could leave the counties and FHWA with a facility having many operational, maintenance and safety liabilities. If FHWA were forced to select between a rehabilitation alternative and Alternative 1, FHWA's stewardship responsibilities would require it to select Alternative 1. "Plans and specifications . . . shall provide for a facility that will (1) Adequately serve the existing and planned future traffic of the highway in a manner that is conducive to safety, durability and economy of maintenance . . ."

Alternative 6 was developed in response to comments received on the DEIS. Many commentaries disagree with the extent of reconstruction proposed for the build alternatives. Alternative 6 includes much more rehabilitation (63 percent of the route) than the DEIS alternatives (49 percent under Alternative 5 and zero percent under the remaining DEIS alternatives). Also, the proposed amount of light and full reconstruction under Alternative 6 are substantially less than the DEIS build alternatives. For further information see **Section II.D.1-3**.

D. The Sierra Club Alternative provides a sensible solution to preserve the beauty and rustic character of the area

The Sierra Club Alternative for an inadequate level of improvement for the road because it does not allow for correction of the most hazardous conditions. The improvements provided for in the Sierra Club Alternative are also short-lived and would not be sufficient for the projected traffic volumes in 20 years. If the FHWA were obligated to select between the Sierra Club Alternative and Alternative 1, FHWA's stewardship responsibilities would require it to select the Alternative 1. "Plans and specifications . . . shall provide for a facility that will (1) Adequately serve the existing and planned future traffic of the highway in a manner that is conducive to safety, durability and economy of maintenance . . ."

Alternative 6 was created to more closely match the existing road, while providing adequate safety and maintenance improvements. The improvements would preserve the character of the area better than the DEIS build alternatives. For further information see **Section II.F.8**.

E. If the Sierra Club proposal is eliminated, then prefer Alternative 1: No-Action

This comment has been noted and will be considered as part of the official documentation for this project.

F. The Build Alternatives create a roadway that is too wide, with too much cut slope, too many retaining walls, unnecessary shoulders, etc. – the Sierra Club Alternative stays within the current footprint

The Sierra Club Alternative provides an inadequate level of improvement for the road because it does not allow correction of the most hazardous conditions. These improvements are also short-lived and would not be sufficient for the projected traffic volumes in 20 years. Because of this, the alternative was eliminated from consideration. If the FHWA were forced to select between the Sierra Club Alternative and the Alternative 1, FHWA's stewardship responsibilities would require it to select the Alternative 1. These responsibilities are described in the Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) at 23 CFR Part 625.2 which states that "Plans and specifications . . . shall provide for a facility that will (1) Adequately serve the existing and planned future traffic of the highway in a manner that is conducive to safety, durability and economy of maintenance . . ."

Alternative 6 was developed to more closely match the existing alignment of the roadway than the DEIS build alternatives. Alternative 6 changes the functional classification of the roadway to a rural local road. This classification is consistent with a lower design speed with sharper roadway curves, a narrower roadway width, and a smaller design vehicle than the DEIS build alternatives. For further information see **Section II.F.8**.

G. Don't want road reconstructed, just stabilized as in the Sierra Club Alternative

The Sierra Club Alternative provides an inadequate level of improvement for the road because it does not allow correction the most hazardous conditions. These improvements are also temporary and would not be sufficient for the projected traffic volumes in 20 years. If the FHWA were forced to select between the Sierra Club Alternative and Alternative 1, FHWA's stewardship responsibilities would require it to select Alternative 1. These responsibilities are described in the Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) at 23 CFR Part 625.2 which states that "Plans and specifications . . . shall provide for a facility that will (1) Adequately serve the existing and planned future traffic of the highway in a manner that is conducive to safety, durability and economy of maintenance . . ."

Alternative 6 was created to more closely match the existing road, while providing adequate safety and maintenance improvements. The improvements would preserve the beauty and fit in with the character of the area better than the DEIS build alternatives. For further information see **Section II.F.8**.

Category 8: Alternative 1 - No Action

This category includes comments made in favor of leaving the roadway as it is. These commentaries expressed opposition to all of the build alternatives in the DEIS. Many of the commentaries indicated that their choice of Alternative 1 was based on not having a minimal improvement alternative to choose. If a minimal improvement alternative were available, then the minimal improvement alternative would be their choice. The subcategories listed in favor Alternative 1 are:

A. If reconstructed, unspoiled wilderness areas are more difficult to access

This is correct. One of the goals of the FS is to limit access to sensitive wilderness areas. Proposed improvements would limit access through the use of designated pullouts, guardrail, and other barriers.

B. Existing road serves its purpose for the area it transverses

FHWA, the FS and the maintaining agencies do not agree. The present poor condition of the road illustrates its inability to adequately accommodate existing use. Part of the need for the proposed improvements to the road is to both accommodate and control access to the recreational facilities the FS manages. Improvements to the roadway provide an opportunity for the FS to better manage the locations used for parking; control off-road camping, parking, and travel in areas where it is not desired; and install interpretive pullouts and signs. The primary purpose of the road is, and will continue to be, to provide safe recreational access to the national forests and access to the facilities mentioned above. For further information see **Section I.C.1d**.

C. Roads like Guanella Pass are an adventure and limit traffic by their nature

See response to subcategory B, above.

D. Negative impacts outweigh any advantages of improvements

Based on the Purpose and Need of the project described in Chapter I, the need for improvements to the roadway is substantial, whereas many of the negative impacts can be mitigated or minimized by careful planning. Transportation needs, environmental needs, and maintenance needs for the roadway are all greater than the impacts that may result from improvements under Alternative 6. The benefits of improvements to the road will outweigh the negative impacts of the project. Negative impacts have been substantially mitigated/reduced from those identified for the DEIS build alternatives. For further information see **Section I.C**.

E. Against improving and/or widening

This comment has been noted and will be considered as part of the official documentation for this project.

F. The area can't handle impacts associated with increased use, such as increased amounts of traffic, equipment, costs for maintenance, and the need for increased emergency services

Under alternative 1 (No-Action), projected increases in use are 56 percent over existing use. Failure to perform improvements to the road will make it even more difficult to manage this increase in use. The FS supports improvements of Guanella Pass Road as a means to help preserve the Scenic Byway. Visitor use of the Guanella Pass area continues to increase, making it increasingly difficult for the FS to manage. The FS feels that the proposed improvements will aid in their ability to manage the area by restricting the use of sensitive areas by recreationalists.

Alternative 6 results in the least amount of traffic of all build alternatives, and though it increases speed it also increases roadway safety. Construction activities and equipment hauling will be performed so as to minimize impacts to the area. (Maintenance costs are lower for all build alternatives than for Alternative 1.)

Traffic

Under Alternative 1, traffic volumes are projected to increase approximately 56 percent over the 1995 values by the year 2025. The improvements to the roadway under Alternative 6 increase traffic volumes over Alternative 1 levels by 20 percent at the summit. Because of the sharp curvature, narrow roadway width, and low speed limits, traffic volumes are not expected to increase as much under Alternative 6 compared to the DEIS build alternatives, which increase traffic volumes 35-80 percent over Alternative 1 volumes at the summit. Management of the roadway and enforcement of speed, weight, and vehicle limits would be the responsibility of local agencies. For further information see **Section III.B.1b**.

Equipment

Some construction impacts are anticipated under any of the build alternatives during construction activities. However, mitigation measures will be implemented during construction activities such as scheduling during off-peak periods, when possible; use of construction haul routes that minimize local impacts; and the use of approved portions of the right-of-way for storing material and placing equipment. For further information see **Section III.B.6**.

Costs for maintenance

The improved surface makes maintenance less resource intensive, easier, and less expensive. Winter closure of the road would also reduce maintenance costs associated with plowing the road (note: the winter closure issue will be decided by local agencies). For further information see **Section III.C.11**.

Emergency services

Calls for emergency services could reasonably be expected to increase proportionally to the amount of increased traffic. Given this assumption, the emergency service calls for Alternative 1 could be expected to increase by 56 percent over 1995 values by the year 2025. Alternative 6 will have the least impact of the build alternatives, increasing the number of calls an additional 20 percent over the Alternative 1. It should be noted that despite the increases in speed, the increased site and stopping distances and improved road geometry proposed under all build alternatives may reduce accidents, thereby reducing the need for emergency services. For further information see **Section III.C.10**.

G. Guanella Pass should remain a rustic/scenic roadway

Alternative 6 more closely matches the existing road, while providing adequate safety and maintenance improvements. The improvements would preserve the beauty and fit in with the character of the area better than the DEIS build alternatives. For further information see **Sections I.B.4 and II.B.6 and III.B.3**.

Category 9: Overall Cost

This category addresses the objections to reconstruction because of the overall costs that would be incurred. The costs identified range from costs to the counties for maintenance to the costs of right-of-way acquisition. The concerns of the overall costs resulting from major improvements are as follows:

A. The difference in costs between paving, not paving, and minor improvements is substantial

The construction cost for Alternative 6 is less than Alternatives 2-5. Projected costs for Alternative 6 are \$28.9 million as compared to \$29.2, \$35.9, \$44.6 and \$46.1 million for Alternatives 4, 5, 3, and 2 respectively. Alternative 6 includes a much greater amount of rehabilitation Alternatives 2-5. Rehabilitation is less expensive than full reconstruction.

In regard to minor improvements, it is not considered a wise investment of resources to perform spot road improvements (e.g. further reduce the proposed width, resurface the road without widening narrow sections, or not correct the most deficient alignment and geometric inconsistencies) that soon will become inadequate or inappropriate. The most hazardous conditions would be left unaddressed and may leave the Counties, FS and the FHWA with a facility having many operational, maintenance, and safety liabilities. For further information see **Sections III.B.6b and III.C.11**.

B. Park and Clear Creek Counties and the taxpayers will end up paying for long-term maintenance, increased patrols, and litter pick-up

Long-term maintenance

The cost of maintenance of the road for 20 years after construction of Alternative 6 is 64 percent of the cost of maintenance under the Alternative 1 assuming that the road surfaces are maintained to a level consistent with standard recommended practices, preferred surface conditions, and projected traffic volumes. In essence, maintenance of Alternative 6 is less costly than trying to maintain the status quo. The project allows the Counties to get more for their maintenance dollar than what they are getting now.

Winter closure (to be decided by the land management agencies) will also reduce the maintenance costs associated with plowing the road. Winter closure helps preserve the surface structure by reducing the exposure of the surface to freeze-thaw cycles that result when the road is cleared of snow. The snow acts as insulation to the road that protects it from the temperature extremes that occur between the winter days and nights. For further information see **Section III.C.11**.

Increased patrols

Based on the number of current emergency response calls and the projected traffic volumes, it is expected that the emergency services will see an increase in calls and requests for assistance. It is not clear, however, how much of an increase can be expected. A reasonable assumption would be that the increase in calls is proportional to the amount of increased traffic. Given this assumption, Alternative 6 will have the least impact of the build alternatives and increase the number of calls an additional 20 percent over Alternative 1. For further information see **Section III.C.10**.

Litter

Additional traffic, which is expected under all alternatives including the Alternative 1, means more tourists and visitors in Georgetown and other portions of the study area. While this translates to additional income for the tourist-dependent business, it could also result in increased congestion, littering, and impacts on the natural environment. This could lead to additional demand for community services such as trash removal. However, increased and better management of these areas could address these issues. In addition, an increase in people to the area also translates into an increase in taxable sales, which would help to offset the additional costs for community services. For further information see **Section III.C.10**.

C. Spend this money on other projects, such as: US 285 (most frequently mentioned), Interstate 70, Hwy 9 to Breckenridge, Bear Creek, or a skyway from Denver to Vail

The Forest Highway Program provides federal funding for capital improvements of a special category of public roads that directly serve National Forest lands nationwide. This roadway system is designated as the Forest Highway road system. Federal funding (Forest Highway Funds) is allocated for the Forest Highway Program, specifically, as other federal funding would be allocated for the types of projects mentioned above. Interstate 70, US 285, and Highway 9 are not Forest Highways and therefore are not eligible for this funding. For further information see **Section I.B.1**.

D. Costs to Clear Creek and Park Counties due to damages brought forward by local businesses (Example: Tumbling River Ranch)

Comment noted. These types of costs cannot be estimated.

E. Counties are currently unable to keep up with maintenance costs of paved portions on Guanella Pass Road; therefore, they would not be able to maintain the costs of the road if fully paved

As traffic volumes increase over time, and the roadway continues to age, the need for increased maintenance will continue. However, lack of monetary resources will result in accelerated deterioration of the road. Lack of maintenance will contribute to environmental degradation of the area through dust, erosion, and sedimentation.

Objective number four of the Project Objectives (see **Section I.D**) is to reduce anticipated maintenance costs of Guanella Pass Road. Alternative 6 reduces maintenance costs as compared to the other alternatives, including the Alternative 1. Under Alternative 6, 20-year maintenance costs would be 64 percent of the Alternative 1 maintenance cost due to the longer life expectancy of the improved roadway. For further information see **Sections I.C.3, I.D and III.C.11**.

F. Paving and widening is an overly expensive alternative

Alternative 6 reduces the amount of paving and allows a narrower roadway cross-section than Alternatives 2-5. The construction cost for Alternative 6 is less Alternatives 2-5. Projected costs for Alternative 6 are \$28.9 million as compared to \$29.2, \$35.9, \$44.6 and \$46.1 million for Alternatives 4, 5, 3, and 2 respectively.

Additionally, maintenance costs under Alternative 6 would be 64 percent of Alternative 1 over a 20-year period. For further information see **Section III.B.6b**.

G. Costs to counties for right-of-way acquisition from local landowners and businesses

The right-of-way necessary for Alternative 6 along the road corridor is expected to be less than any of Alternatives 2-5. Alternative 6 calls for a decreased amount of full reconstruction, reduced roadway width, and lower design speed, all of which result in a closer match to the existing roadway and associated right-of-way. See reference section for information on the amount of right-of-way that needs to be acquired by each county. For further information see **Section III.C.5**.

Category 10: Benefits of Improving Guanella Pass Road

This category summarizes commentaries indicating there are benefits to making major improvements to Guanella Pass Road. The subcategories of the benefits of improving Guanella Pass Road are as follows:

A. Reconstruction will save Guanella Pass from dust and runoff impacts; as well as reduce maintenance costs; increase safety; and decrease unauthorized camping, parking, and social trails

The Alternative 2-5 were developed to address roadway safety and operational issues and the overall condition of the road.

B. Improvements will ensure future maintainability for the roadway

Improvements will facilitate future maintainability, as future maintenance costs under the DEIS build alternatives and Alternative 6 are projected to be less than under the Alternative 1. For further information see **Section III.C.11**.

C. Positive economic impacts

Traffic volumes on Guanella Pass Road are projected to increase after completion of construction under all of the build alternatives, which, in turn, creates increased sales for local businesses. Under Alternative 6, however, traffic volumes are not expected to increase as much as they would under Alternatives 2-5. Therefore, economic benefits would not be as great under Alternative 6. For further information see **Section III.B.1d**.

Category 11: Use the Federal Money for Major Improvements to Guanella Pass Road

This category addresses comments in favor of utilizing the money that the Federal Government is offering and making the proposed improvements to Guanella Pass Road. Commentaries indicate

that the improvements are necessary for the future existence of the road. The subcategories for the commentaries in favor of using the Federal money for major improvements to Guanella Pass Road are as follows:

A. Park and Clear Creek Counties have limited resources to rehabilitate the road

For this reason, the Counties appealed to the Forest Highway Program to fund the improvements to the road. However, the Counties would still be responsible for future maintenance costs for the road.

B. Paving the road would be beneficial to correct the current problems

While paving is an option for an improved roadway, using a hardened surface or other alternative surface types are also proposed in specific locations to correct identified problems. For further information see **Section II.B.6a**.

C. The road could become inaccessible due to dangerous driving conditions – the road is in need of improvements for future maintainability

Based on the project objectives, Alternatives 2-5 were developed to address roadway safety issues and the overall condition of the road.

Category 12: Minimal Improvements

This category describes comments that stress the need for repair or maintenance for the road, but not to the extent proposed by the Build Alternatives. Commentaries expressed that Alternatives 2-5 are above and beyond what the roadway needs, but that “No-Action” will not solve the problems that exist. Comments range from a suggestion for rehabilitation to no pavement beyond Geneva Park. Comments are in favor of minimal improvements and the subcategories are as follows:

A. In favor of minimal repairs

To fulfill the project objectives identified for this project such as safety, drainage, and slope stability, full reconstruction is necessary for certain areas of the roadway. Alternative 6 was developed to provide a greater amount of rehabilitation of the roadway, with full reconstruction proposed only for areas with substantial safety and/or maintenance concerns.

Minimal repairs would not address the most deficient alignment and geometric inconsistencies. The most hazardous conditions would be left unaddressed and may leave the Counties, FS, and the FHWA with a facility having many operational, maintenance, and safety liabilities. For further information see **Sections I.C and II.F.8**.

B. Major maintenance would be too costly

As traffic volumes increase over time, and the roadway continues to age, maintenance needs increase. An improved roadway, however, requires less resources and money to maintain. The greater longevity of the improved roadway would also keep maintenance costs down over time. For further information see **Section III.C.11**.

C. Minor repairs should be supported by federal funds through county maintenance activities

Minor repairs are not supported by the project objectives, as stated in **Chapter I: Purpose and Need**. In addition, the Federal funding available for this project is limited for a specific category of construction projects and cannot be used to fund maintenance activities. For further information see **Section II.F.5**.

D. Perform modest improvements including one or more of the following: safety, drainage, sedimentation, and/or recreational use improvements

After the release of the DEIS, many commentaries agreed with the need for repair or maintenance of the road, but not to the extent described by Alternatives 2-5 included in the DEIS. Alternative 6 was developed to provide more modest improvements to the roadway including the needed safety, drainage, sedimentation, and/or recreational use improvements. For further information see **Sections I.B.1 and I.C**.

E. No widening beyond what exists now, i.e., do not widen to FHWA standards

While the DEIS build alternatives proposed a widening of the roadway to 24 feet, Alternative 6 provides for a roadway width of 22 feet, based on the rural local road functional classification. The existing roadway width varies between 18 and 24 feet. To meet minimum AASHTO design guidelines, the roadway needs to be widened by up to four feet in some areas. For further information see **Section II.D.4**.

F. Do not pave on the Park County side of Guanella Pass/beyond Geneva Park

A justification for the types of improvements proposed for each of the segments in Alternative 6 is provided in **Appendix C: Rationale for the Design Criteria and the Proposed Improvements**. The reasons for proposed reconstruction and paving in certain areas beyond Geneva Park (particularly Shelf Road) are the substantial safety concerns (such as steep cut slopes and heavy rockfall) and deficient roadway conditions (such as poor drainage).

G. Provide regular maintenance

In the past, Park and Clear Creek Counties expended a great proportion of their available resources and money trying to maintain Guanella Pass Road. Even with their efforts, the level of maintenance has been inadequate. The counties agree that additional maintenance of the roadway is desirable, but budget restrictions and the large amount of work required have prohibited this.

Under Alternative 6, the improved roadway would require less resources and money to maintain. The roadway would be easier to maintain for a longer period of time. Better maintenance results in a safer road, an enhanced recreational driving experience, and less dust, erosion, and sedimentation. For further information see **Section I.C.3**.

H. Improve, but do not pave or change the footprint of the roadway

Alternative 6 was developed to make needed improvements to the roadway such as safety and maintenance, while more closely matching the existing width and alignment. Alternative 6 also provides for the use of alternative surface types instead of pavement or gravel surfaces. The alternative surface types would provide a hardened surface while retaining a rustic look and feel. For further information see **Sections I.B.1 and II.B.6.**

I. Pursue rehabilitation

Alternative 6 was developed to provide a greater amount of rehabilitation of the roadway, with full reconstruction proposed only for areas with substantial safety and/or maintenance concerns. Alternative 6 proposes 63 percent of the roadway for rehabilitation, 18 percent for light reconstruction, and 19 percent for full reconstruction. The DEIS build alternatives proposed full reconstruction for the entire length of the road with the exception of Alternative 4 (49 percent no action) and Alternative 5 (49 percent rehabilitation). For further information see **Section II.D.1-3.**

Category 13: Issues with the Guanella Pass Public Hearings

This category addresses comments concerning issues with the Guanella Pass Road public hearings that took place. The following comments were made concerning the public hearings:

A. Not a true public hearing because it did not facilitate discussion

Public hearings were held on August 3, 4, and 5, 1999 to receive public input on the DEIS. At these hearings, a court recorder took public comments and written comments were also received. In the interest of providing the most productive forum for these hearings, FHWA employees and other representatives knowledgeable about the project were present to encourage one-on-one discussions with the public to answer questions and facilitate discussion.

Based on public sentiment that the public hearings did not facilitate discussion, additional public hearings were held by the Counties to provide for a format that would facilitate discussion. The additional public hearings were held in Clear Creek County on August 20, 1999 and in Park County on August 25, 1999. For further information see **Section I.B.2-4.**

B. The open house format limited debate – interested in learning other people's thoughts about the pros and cons of the project

Based on public sentiment that the initial public hearings did not facilitate discussion, additional public hearings were held by the Counties to provide for a format that would facilitate discussion. The additional public hearings were held in Clear Creek County on August 20, 1999 and in Park County on August 25, 1999.

All comments received on the EIS process for Guanella Pass Road are a matter of public record and have been made available for public review. Also, all comments received have been considered and used for the development of Alternative 6. For further information see **Section I.B.2-4.**

Category 14: Recreational safety considerations

This category addresses comments made about the need for consideration of recreational safety in any plans for improvement. Bicycling enthusiasts made many of these comments, but other types of recreationalists, such as hikers and horseback riders made some. The subcategories for recreational safety considerations are as follows:

A. Need to improve hiking/biking trails and provide a shoulder wide enough to accommodate bicyclists

The proposed improvements under Alternative 6 include a shoulder two feet wide. In addition, some of the existing tight curves are reconstructed with more gradual curves, reducing the number of blind spots and improving sight distances. Adding width to the roadway to accommodate pedestrians and bicycles was eliminated from consideration because of the additional environmental impacts that would occur. Motor vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists will have to share the road. For further information see **Section II.F.4**.

B. Put in emergency phones for recreationalists

Emergency phones along Guanella Pass Road are addressed in the Corridor Management Strategy (CMS) developed by the FS and Scenic Byway Committee. Recommendations made in the CMS concerning emergency phones include an emergency phone system that is accessible year round at Guanella Pass Campground and emergency phones at one of the summit parking lots and at Burning Bear Campground. The emergency phone system is not within the scope of this project.

C. Include American Discovery Trail on Guanella Pass Road

The American Discovery Trail corridor (in the planning stage) will cross near Guanella Pass. This trail corridor will connect California and Maryland. To date, there are no plans to dedicate a specific trail on Guanella Pass Road.

Category 15: Negative impacts on local economies

This category addresses concerns about the negative impacts that major improvements would have on the local economy. The commentaries stated different reasons for negative impacts ranging from the bypassing of Georgetown to construction that would take place within and outside of Georgetown. The subcategories related to negative effects on the local economy due to major improvements are as follows:

A. Bypassing Georgetown adversely affects business owners by taking away business

None of the bypass options for the Town of Georgetown presented in the DEIS were considered desirable. All were dropped from further consideration. For further information see **Sections II.F.6 and II.F.9**.

B. Impacts within Georgetown – the additional traffic through Georgetown creates more business, employees are difficult to find, inadequate parking, and congestion

Alternative 6 was developed to reduce project impacts such as, increased traffic, to the surrounding areas. Traffic volume increases under Alternative 6 are projected to increase an additional 20 percent over the year 2025 Alternative 1 volumes.

Traffic increases may increase the demand for parking and create seasonal parking problems during the high-visitor months of June through September. Currently, the downtown business district provides sufficient parking. Overflow peak parking is required three times during the year: 4th of July, aspen viewing season, and Christmas Market. During these special events, buses are used to transport visitors to and from off-site parking locations.

The Georgetown Planning Commission is concerned with current traffic flow problems at certain locations within the downtown area. Numerous bypass routes were evaluated to address their concerns to divert through traffic around downtown Georgetown. However, none were considered desirable and they were dropped from consideration. The Town will address parking issues and congestion that might result from traffic volume increases. For further information see **Sections III.B.1b and 1.d.**

C. Businesses (such as Tumbling River Ranch) will assert substantial monetary claims for compensation and damages

The FHWA is making an effort to work with and minimize impacts to local businesses.

D. Many local businesses contribute substantially to the economy (Tumbling River Ranch) – if these businesses fold due to construction, the impact would be significant to the economy

Three case studies are provided in the FEIS for three communities that have experienced roadway construction projects similar to the proposed improvements to Guanella Pass Road. Based on the three economic case studies, construction activities did not conclusively have a substantial negative impact on any of the three towns studied.

In addition, a survey of 14 members of the Colorado Association of Dude and Guest Ranches was conducted to help assess the potential impact that improvements to Guanella Pass Road will have on the dude ranch located along the road. Three of the ranches surveyed currently have road construction on the road to their ranch. None of the three have experienced any negative impacts, mainly due to the fact that the guests make their reservations well in advance. For further information see **Sections III.B.1d, III.B.6h, and III.B.6i.**

Category 16: Construction Impacts

This category addresses concerns about the actual construction impacts that might occur from a seven to ten year construction period. These impacts are to occur under each of the build alternatives over the entire time, length, and geographic area of the construction. The subcategories related to the construction impacts resulting from major improvements to Guanella Pass are as follows:

A. Wildlife would be negatively impacted by the noise, trucks, and habitat disturbance

Several mitigation measures will be taken to reduce construction impacts to wildlife. For a complete list of construction mitigation measures for wildlife, see the reference sections provided. For further information see **Sections IV.G and IV.I.**

B. The environment would be impacted due to construction runoff, noxious weed introduction, and the removal of native species

Construction runoff

During construction, best management practices (BMP's) will be used as directed by the project engineer to reduce runoff velocity and extract sediment.

Despite the caution that will be taken during construction activities to avoid impacts to water quality, minimal impacts could occur. However, the short-term impacts that could result from construction activities are far outweighed by the long-term improvements to water quality that will result from the drainage improvements to the roadway. For further information see **Section IV.I.3.**

Noxious weed introduction

Construction equipment will be washed before entering the National Forest system lands to reduce the chance of introducing foreign weed seeds to the ecosystem. In addition, all imported fill material and revegetation plant mixes will be weed-free. For further information see **Section IV.I.1.**

Removal of native species

Much of the right-of-way disturbance along the existing road was either untreated at the time of the original construction or seeded with introduced species. Once construction is complete, denuded slopes will be revegetated with native cover using modern revegetation materials and techniques. This constitutes a positive effect of the proposed actions. A comprehensive revegetation plan will be developed in coordination with the FS and the local weed control officer and implemented in disturbed areas. For further information see **Sections III.C.15 and IV.G.**

C. The local economy would be affected because visitors will avoid the construction area

Alternative 6 would require less hauling and construction activity than Alternatives 2-5 (consistent with a lesser amount of reconstruction and/or paving). Alternative 6 reduces the duration of a construction project by incorporating more rehabilitation and light reconstruction sections into the project.

While construction activities might affect the local economy temporarily during certain periods, measures will be taken to lessen impacts to the area (see reference section). Also, the case studies provided in the FEIS of similar construction projects show that negative economic impacts did not result from construction activities. For further information see **Sections III.B.6I and IV.I.1.**

D. The local traffic will be congested due to construction delays as well as by the large trucks and equipment

Alternative 6 is aimed at reducing the amount of construction traffic required for the project by incorporating on-site materials sources, on-site staging areas and constructing a haul route through Georgetown that will minimize impacts to traffic. Any construction activities will involve traffic delays. However, several measures would be taken to ensure that delays are minimized. For further information see **Sections III.B.6 and IV.I.2.**

E. A time frame of seven to ten years is too long and will place undue stress on the area

Under the DEIS build alternatives, the worst-case scenario projected that construction activities would take place over seven to ten years. Alternative 6 was developed in an effort to address the many concerns, including the impact that the construction seasons will have on the community. Under Alternative 6, the construction in Clear Creek County will be done in two phases and will require no more than three construction seasons for each phase. The construction period on the Park County side will also be done in two phases and will require two construction seasons for each phase. Construction staging has not yet been determined. The FHWA will plan phases of construction in coordination with the Counties and local communities. For further information see **Section III.B.6.**

Categories 17-22

Categories 17-22 Categories 17-22 all indicate a preference for a particular Alternative listed in the DEIS or the SDEIS. These preferences have been noted. The categories correspond to the Alternatives as follows:

Category 17: DEIS Alternative #1

Category 18: DEIS Alternative #2

Category 19: DEIS Alternative #3

Category 20: DEIS Alternative #4

Category 21: DEIS Alternative #5

Category 22: DEIS Alternative #6

Responses to SDEIS COMMENTS

Category 23: SDEIS Issues Need To Be Elaborated

This category addresses comments concerning issues in the SDEIS that were not thoroughly discussed. The subcategories for SDEIS issues that need to be elaborated are as follows:

A. Sedimentation issues

Details on water quality standards, sediment transport, and runoff information are found in the *Hydrologic, Water Quality, Sediment Transport, and Bulk Atmospheric-Deposition Data, Guanella Pass Area, Colorado* (October 1, 1994, through September 30th, 1997, USGS).

The FS monitors areas along Guanella Pass Road (within their jurisdiction) for sedimentation concentrations. The current levels are not acceptable with FS standards and guidelines, and the rate at which sedimentation occurs is increasing. This is a cause of concern for the FS. Under Alternative 6, improvements such as improved drainage facilities, provision of sediment traps, hardened surface types, and revegetation of barren slopes are also part of the proposed improvements. For further information see **Section I.C.2b and III.B.2a**.

B. Impacts to Local Businesses

A more detailed discussion on potential impacts to the local businesses along Guanella Pass Road area is included in the FEIS (see reference sections). Additional information includes a more detailed analysis of noise impacts on the area during construction activities and additional mitigation measures to be used during construction activities. Possible mitigation techniques to control noise include restricting noisy construction operations to specific times of the day and specific days of the year and requiring adequate mufflers on all equipment. For further information see **Sections III.B.6, III.B.1d, and IV.I**.

C. Number of construction trucks on road

This information has been updated and expanded upon in the FEIS. For further information see **Section III.B.6c**.

D. Clarification of construction period

More detailed information concerning construction schedules and closure periods is provided in the FEIS (see reference section). This information specifies the times of the day, days of the week, seasons of the year, and number of construction seasons that construction activities and closures will take place. For further information see **Section III.B.6**.

E. Cost of maintenance

Costs for maintenance were developed based on traffic volumes, future surface conditions, climatic conditions, and the Counties' maintenance budgets and resources. The process used to develop the costs was based on a valid and accepted means of calculating costs for such a project. The maintenance costs are intended to give a general feel for relative costs. For further information see **Section III.C.11**.

F. Impacts to Georgetown

Issues specific to Georgetown are addressed in **Section III.G.1b**. Based on agency correspondence, the Town appears to accept the proposed design and drainage improvements of Alternative 6, within their jurisdiction. The FHWA is committed to addressing the concerns about impacts to the Town of Georgetown. For further information see **Section IV.I.4 and III.G**.

G. Traffic numbers

The traffic volume information presented in the SDEIS is based on traffic studies completed between August of 1994 and August of 1995. This traffic count data is presented in its entirety in the *Guanella Pass Road Traffic Study, Technical Memorandum, Traffic Volume Projections*, (MK Centennial, September 29, 2001). The information-gathering methods presented in this technical memorandum as well as in the SDEIS are based on accepted engineering techniques and standards.

The year 2025 No-Action traffic projections for the road were updated to reflect an annual traffic increase of 1.5 percent, which is consistent with the rate of increases for roads 'similar to' Guanella Pass Road.

H. Traffic on US 285

This report is focused on impacts from the Guanella Pass Road project. Traffic on US 285 may or may not have any influence on this project. FHWA initially considered including US 285 expansion as part of its cumulative effects analysis but eliminated it from consideration when it was learned that expansion would only extend west to Bailey, CO.

I. Character issues of road

Table IV- 8 in the SDEIS presented road character elements to better address the issues relative to each build alternative. **Table III-12** elaborates on these issues by including more character elements. The Town of Georgetown, Clear Creek County, and Park County developed these character elements. For further information see **Section III.B.3**.

J. Impacts to wildlife

Wildlife impacts of Alternative 6 are of the lowest magnitude of any build alternative. See **Section III.B.5: Plants and Animals** for additional information on impacts to wildlife.

K. Pedestrian/bike/equestrian issues

Adding width to the roadway to accommodate pedestrians and bicycles was eliminated from consideration because of the additional environmental impacts that would occur. Pedestrians and bicyclists will have to “share the road” with motor vehicles.

The FHWA is working to minimize impacts to equestrian usage, including the creation of an equestrian trail (see **Section II.E.4**). For further information see **Sections II.F.4 and III.B.4c**.

L. No mitigation for people affected by construction

In addition to the construction mitigation measures listed in the SDEIS, other mitigation is discussed in the FEIS to prevent disruption to the community and tourists visiting the area. An additional mitigation measure includes the location of staging areas within the Guanella Pass Road corridor to reduce the amount of construction truck traffic. Haul routes that avoid most of Georgetown’s business areas are also under consideration and would reduce impacts to residents and visitors. For further information see **Section IV.I**.

M. No litigation for easements and ROW

Property acquisitions will be done in accordance with applicable provisions of the Uniform Relocation and Real Property act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) and the Uniform Relocation Act Amendment of 1987. For further information see **Section III.C.5**.

N. Traffic during construction

The FEIS includes additional information about traffic delays during construction. One option for mitigation of construction delays includes the location of staging areas within the Guanella Pass Road corridor to reduce the amount of construction truck traffic. Construction traffic will be routed through Georgetown using an agreed upon route that minimizes traffic impacts. Construction of a bridge at 7th Street is under consideration and would allow the haul route to bypass most of Georgetown’s high traffic areas. For further information see **Sections III.B.6g and IV.I**.

O. Changes that may occur in design

Design issues are discussed in as much detail as possible for the current phase of this project. An important consideration in the design of improvements to Guanella Pass Road is to maintain flexibility in decision-making. Committing to specific final design elements early in the NEPA process limits future design considerations to the extent that future design cannot address different issues and concerns that may arise during the NEPA process and after the process has been completed. In addition, providing information on every potential change that could occur in the final design phase would be neither practical nor cost-effective. For further information see **Section II.G**.

P. Vibrations due to construction

A vibration study was conducted in Georgetown between June 18, 2001 and July 10, 2001. This study was conducted simultaneously with the placement of test strips of alternative surface types. The test results indicate that the vibrations created by the construction traffic are well below the levels considered to be harmful to historic structures. For further information see **Section III.B.6f**.

Q. Difference between light reconstruction and rehabilitation

Light reconstruction work can include all of the activities listed under rehabilitation as well as additional activities (see reference section) so long as the work occurs within the existing road's original construction disturbance. For further information see **Section II.D.4e.ii**.

R. Economic impact determination

A more detailed analysis of economic impacts for local communities is included in the FEIS. Additional information includes case studies for three communities that have experienced roadway construction projects similar to the proposed improvements to Guanella Pass Road. Based on the three economic case studies, construction activities did not conclusively have a negative impact on any of the three towns studied. However, deterrents to the growth of the economies of Georgetown, Grant, and Bailey could occur if the road is improved. These deterrents could include traffic congestion and limited parking that tends to discourage visitors. For further information see **Section III.B.1d, III.B.6h**.

S. Vague language

All information presented in the SDEIS is based on analysis and research that has been completed by professionals with extensive knowledge and training in these fields. In some cases language may appear to sound vague due to circumstances such as a lack of information available (this is generally stated in the text) or the phase of the project, which might not allow for the availability of specific information at the time. An example of this would be certain design issues. Because final design issues are not addressed and solidified until later phases of the project, only the preliminary design information is provided.

T. Air quality

Air quality is not elaborated upon in the SDEIS because Alternative 6 would cause no supplemental environmental impacts to air quality. As noted, the dust suppression of the alternative surface types is a beneficial impact to the air quality in the corridor. For further information see **Section III.C.1**.

U. Environmental issues

All environmental issues for improvements to Guanella Pass Road have been addressed in the FEIS in accordance with NEPA standards and all other federal regulations.

V. Community involvement

Numerous public meetings, workshops, and hearings have been held since the project's inception (see referenced section) to inform the public about the project and receive public input.

Alternative 6 was developed based on public comments received on the DEIS. The new alternative was developed by the FHWA in cooperation with Clear Creek County, the Town of Georgetown, Park County, the FS, and the CDOT. These agencies participated in numerous work group sessions to coordinate a response to public comments and develop a new alternative for public consideration. These work group sessions were held from early February through early May 2000 and were open to the public for observation. For further information see **Section I.B.2-4 and Chapter VII**.

W. Visual impacts

The SDEIS presents a table of road character elements (**Table IV-8**) to better address the issues for visual quality relative to each build alternative. The FEIS elaborates on these issues (**Table III-12**) by including more character elements. The Town of Georgetown, Clear Creek County, and Park County developed these character elements. For further information see **Section III.B.3**.

Y. School children impacts

Construction routes for the project will avoid the streets near the school, if possible. In addition, it is expected that truck traffic will operate below existing traffic speeds.

Z. Quality of life

During the preparation of the DEIS, a survey was given to the people within the Guanella Pass area to understand their perceptions of the project. Most of the respondents believe that their quality of life is impacted by all of the build alternatives. They believe that any improvements to Guanella Pass Road, especially paving, will directly affect the character of the community. Traffic forecasts for each of the alternatives show that Alternative 6 will have the least traffic impact of all build alternatives, thus helping to maintain the community character. In addition, alternative surface types have been proposed as a means of maintaining the rustic character of the road. For further information see **Section III.B.1a**.

AA. Revegetation

Specific revegetation issues are not addressed as a part of the EIS process. Revegetation of cut slopes and other areas will take place in accordance with FHWA's best management practices (BMP's), described in the FHWA Standard Specifications and FS revegetation guidelines. A revegetation plan will be developed in coordination with the local weed control officer and the FS and implemented for disturbed areas. For further information see **Sections IV.I.3 and IV.G**.

Category 24: Problems with the SDEIS

This category addresses comments concerning issues in the SDEIS that were major problems. The subcategories for problems with the SDEIS are as follows:

A. Design vehicle too big

The design vehicle under Alternative 6 is a Class C recreational vehicle with a wheelbase of 17 feet. This is reduced from the DEIS build alternatives, which proposed a design vehicle of a single-unit truck with a wheelbase of 20 feet. The design vehicle for Alternative 6 was chosen to represent a designated class of vehicle that the road is intended to accommodate and is not necessarily the majority of vehicles using the road. Reducing the wheelbase of the design vehicle allows a design that more closely follows the existing roadway and better matches the radii of the existing switchbacks. For further information see **Section II.D.4c**.

B. Not representative of public's wishes

During the comment period for the DEIS, several major issues were identified, including the need to develop a new alternative. The majority of commentaries agreed with the need for repair or maintenance of the road, but not to the extent described by the build alternatives in the DEIS.

Based on comments received from the public on the DEIS, a new alternative was developed by the FHWA in cooperation with Clear Creek County, the Town of Georgetown, Park County, the FS, and the CDOT. These agencies participated in numerous work group sessions to coordinate a response to public comments and develop a new alternative for public consideration. The new alternative was developed to be more responsive than the DEIS build alternatives to the environmental setting and the rustic and rural character of the road. For further information see **Section I.B.4**.

C. Does not address environmental concerns

All environmental issues for improvements to Guanella Pass Road have been addressed in the FEIS in accordance with NEPA standards and all other federal regulations. For further information see **Chapters III and IV**.

D. Time table for construction

Detailed information concerning construction schedules and closure periods is provided in the FEIS. This information details the times of the day, days of the week, and seasons of the year that construction activities and closures are estimated to take place. For further information see **Sections III.B.6a and III.B.6c**.

Category 25: No Guarantee that Guanella Pass Will Not Continue to Change

This category addresses comments made concerning the issue of Guanella Pass continuing to change and develop into a highway. There were no subcategories related to this category.

Response:

Future development activities occurring after construction of Guanella Pass Road are unforeseeable. However, Alternative 6 is intended to maintain the rustic character of the corridor by designating this road as a rural local road, and discourage use of the road as a throughway or highway between Interstate 70 and US 285.

Category 26: Oppose SDEIS Alternative

This category addresses comments opposing Alternative 6. The subcategories for opposing the SDEIS Alternative 6 are as follows:

A. Alternative 6 is not enough of a compromise

The improvements proposed for Guanella Pass Road under Alternative 6 are the minimum acceptable standards set by the FHWA, the FS, and the CDOT to be eligible for federal money under the Forest Highway Program. These standards are the minimum requirements for safety and operations of the traveling public based primarily on anticipated future traffic volumes on the roadway and type of use.

The DEIS contained proposing build alternatives up to 100 percent reconstruction of the road. The FHWA created Alternative 6 with input from local agencies to serve as a compromise from 100 percent full reconstruction to only 19 percent full reconstruction of the road. For further information see **Section II.B.6**.

B. Not enough problems solved by Alternative 6

Alternatives 2-5 were developed to most effectively address all safety issues and the inadequate surface condition of the roadway. The majority of public comments on the DEIS agreed with the need for repair or maintenance of the road, but not to the extent described by the build alternatives in the DEIS. Alternative 6 was developed to balance the need for the necessary improvements to the road with public sentiment and the sensitive environment. For further information see **Section I.B.4**.

Category 27: Comment Previously Addressed (Public Hearing)

This category includes commentaries stating that another member of the public earlier in the public hearing already stated their comment. This category is to ensure that all comments are accounted for. There are no subcategories included with this category.

Category 28: Concerns with Construction

This category addresses comments referring to concerns regarding problems associated with construction. The subcategories for concerns with construction are as follows:

A. Construction impacts on wildlife

The increased noise and activity of construction operations may affect wildlife in the immediate vicinity. Activities such as blasting, clearing, and grading will be appropriately scheduled to minimize the disturbance to wildlife during critical periods (e.g. nesting for sensitive bird species). Other mitigation efforts will be directed toward short-term and long-term reestablishment of habitat and structural diversity. Displacement of birds, mammals, and aquatic life are limited in extent and duration with effective best management practices (BMP's) and mitigation activities. For further information see **Sections III.B.5 and IV.G**.

B. Construction truck traffic

Impacts including noise and traffic congestion will result from construction traffic under any of the EIS alternatives during construction activities. However, mitigation measures will be implemented during construction activities to lessen these impacts. See reference section for a list of these mitigation measures. For further information see **Sections III.B.6c and IV.I.1-2.**

C. Construction of retaining walls

Retaining walls are necessary for sections of the road that have been identified in areas where additional safety measures are needed or in areas where the proposed geometry of the road is not easily accommodated by the existing roadway conditions. The walls under consideration will blend in with the natural setting for a more aesthetic appearance. Several options are presented in the FEIS to reduce potential visual impacts created by retaining walls (see referenced section). These options include tiering and use of context-sensitive materials. For further information see **Section II.G.1**

D. Road surface damage from construction vehicles

Special care will be taken to minimize damage to roads from construction vehicles. Measures such as creating more than one construction route to spread out the impact and reduction of speeds through sensitive areas will be used during construction activities. FHWA is committed to repairing, restoring, or resurfacing roads in Georgetown that are impacted by construction vehicles or equipment. The use of materials source sites and equipment staging areas along the road will reduce the construction vehicle traffic through near by towns. For further information see **Section III.B.6I.**

E. Road location

The alignment Alternative 6 more closely matches the existing road. In areas where safety issues are a substantial concern, a slightly different alignment is proposed to correct these deficiencies. For further information see **Sections II.D.4 and III.B.3.**

F. Construction impacts on the environment

All environmental issues for improvements to Guanella Pass Road have been addressed in the FEIS in accordance with NEPA standards and all other federal regulations.

In addition, the contractor's activities occurring during construction will be closely monitored and are subject to legal requirements as set forth in the design plans and by FHWA standards. Any non-compliance by the contractor as far as all requirements set forth or adherence to design plans would be the liability of the contractor. For further information see **Section IV.I.**

G. Pedestrian/horse/bike safety during construction

Construction activities will discourage recreational use of the Guanella Pass area. Construction related impacts such as noise, dust, visual impacts, and traffic delays will make the construction

zones less appealing to visitors. Construction will be done in limited areas in any given year, so most of the route will be relatively unaffected at any particular time. Mitigation measures will be used to reduce potential impacts to pedestrians, bicyclists, and horses during construction (see reference). For further information see **Section IV.I.1**.

H. Construction impacts on the economy

While construction activities might temporarily affect the local economy during certain phases, measures will be taken to lessen impacts to the area. See reference section for a list of these measures.

In addition to the measures in **Section III.B.6i**, Alternative 6 would require less hauling Alternatives 2-5 (consistent with a lesser amount of reconstruction and/or paving). For further information see **Sections III.B.6h and III.B.6i**.

Category 29: Want Another Alternative

This category addresses comments requesting that another alternative be considered. The subcategories for wanting another alternative are as follows:

A. Winter closure

The decision to close or not maintain Guanella Pass Road during the winter lies with the agencies that have legal jurisdiction of the road: the FS, Park County, Clear Creek County, and the Town of Georgetown. This option may be considered by these agencies in combination with other improvements to the road. For further information see **Section II.E.3**.

B. Road closure

This alternative was eliminated from consideration because it does not adequately address the objectives of the Guanella Pass Road project. In addition, it does not support the activities or meet the FS goals of providing mobility within the project corridor and access for the general public to forest resources. For further information see **Section II.F.1**.

C. Pursue other options for financing road improvements

In 1987, the Counties approached the FHWA to request funding for improvements to Guanella Pass Road. The FHWA has developed roadway improvement alternatives for the Counties to consider. If the Counties do not accept the Record of Decision produced by the FHWA for this project, other opportunities could be pursued with the involvement of the County Commissioners.

D. Control access

Land management agencies are responsible for determining the extent and location of access. In addition, controlling access to the road does not support the activities of the FS and does not meet the FS goals of providing mobility within the project corridor and access for the general public to forest resources. For further information see **Section II.F**.

E. Bypass Georgetown

A construction bypass bridge and haul route along the railroad grade is being considered as a route for construction traffic so that construction trucks will not go through the portions of the town that are of most concern. However, in order to implement this option, the FHWA needs Georgetown to commit to obtaining a temporary easement from the private property owner, over whose property the temporary bridge crosses

None of the permanent bypass options for the Town of Georgetown presented in the DEIS were considered desirable, and all were dropped from further consideration. For further information see **Sections III.B.6c, II.F.6, and II.F.9.**

F. Rehabilitation

To fulfill the project objectives identified for this project such as safety, drainage, and slope stability, a full reconstruction level of improvement is necessary for certain areas of the roadway. Alternative 6 was developed to provide a greater amount of rehabilitation of the roadway, with full reconstruction proposed only for areas with substantial safety and/or maintenance concerns.

In addition, it is not considered a wise investment of resources to perform road improvements (e.g. further reduce the proposed width, resurface the road without widening the narrowest portions, or not correct the most deficient alignment and geometric inconsistencies) that soon will become inadequate or inappropriate. The most hazardous conditions would be left unaddressed and may leave the counties, the FS, and the FHWA with a facility having many operational, maintenance, and safety liabilities. For further information see **Section II.B.6.**

Category 30: How Is the Final Decision Made

This category addresses comments questioning how the final decision of an alternative for Guanella Pass is made. There are no subcategories included with this category.

Response:

The purpose of NEPA is to ensure disclosure of reasonably identifiable environmental impacts that of a proposed action prior to its implementation. The FHWA will determine whether or not the project has a substantial environmental impact or if impacts of the project can be mitigated adequately with proposed mitigation measures. Based on these findings the FHWA will produce a Record of Decision. Voting is not part of the procedure to produce a Record of Decision. The County Commissioners, however, may decide to vote on whether or not to support the ROD or to concur with the final design.

Category 31: FHWA Money Can Be Used Elsewhere

This category addresses comments relating to the fact that FHWA money involved with the Guanella Pass project can be used on other projects if determined it will not be used for this project. There are no subcategories for this category.

Response:

Funds currently allocated for Guanella Pass Road may be used for other Colorado roads in the Forest Highway Program.

Category 32: Too Much Money Spent on this Project

This category addresses comments concerning the issue that too much taxpayer money has been spent to date on this project. There are no subcategories for this category.

Response:

This comment has been noted and will be considered as part of the official documentation for this project.

Category 33: Oppose All FHWA Alternatives

This category addresses comments reflecting opposition to all alternatives presented in both the DEIS and the SDEIS. There are no subcategories for this category.

Response:

This comment has been noted and will be considered as part of the official documentation for this project.

Category 34: Request for Comment Period Extension

This category addresses comments requesting an extension on the cut off date for the public comment period. There are no subcategories for this category.

Response:

The comment period for the SDEIS was extended for 45 days beyond the original deadline.

Category 35: Only Acceptable Alternative Must Include Specific Items

This category addresses comments concerning specific items that must be included in an alternative for the alternative to gain public support. This category contains some of the information in Form Letter #6, however additional information was included with the individual letters addressing these issues and therefore a category 35 was established to address these combined issues. The combined issues that the only acceptable alternative must include are:

A. Original road area must remain in its current limits of disturbance

Alternative 6 was developed to provide an alternative for improvements to Guanella Pass Road that differs from the DEIS build alternatives. The alignment of this new alternative more closely matches the existing roadway. The existing roadway width for the sections proposed for reconstruction under the build alternatives is already narrower than recommended AASHTO guidelines. The proposed width is the minimum recommended under FHWA CFLHD guidelines for the level of traffic, and the minimum that is supported by the FS and the CDOT for reconstruction of this type of forest road with the anticipated level of traffic and the type of use.

It is not considered a wise investment of resources to perform road improvements (e.g. further reduce the proposed width, resurface the road without widening the narrowest portions, or not correct the most deficient alignment and geometric inconsistencies) that soon will become inadequate or inappropriate. To remain entirely within the current limits of disturbance would maintain the most hazardous conditions of the road and would leave the Counties, FS and the FHWA with a facility having many operational, maintenance, and safety liabilities. If FHWA were

required to select between keeping the road entirely within the original limits of disturbance Alternative 1, FHWA would select Alternative 1. For further information see **Section II.B.6.**

B. No heavy construction, blasting, or construction materials hauling should be permitted up either side of the Pass

It is not possible to perform the needed improvements in the given construction season without heavy construction, blasting, and hauling. FHWA has worked very hard to minimize construction impacts to the greatest extent possible. Less than ten percent (possibly less than five percent) of the construction work will require rock blasting. The rock blasting is mostly anticipated for reduction of small isolated rock outcrops and individual boulders, and is necessary to address safety issues.

Mitigation measures will be used to minimize impacts from construction activities. Continued coordination will take place between the FHWA and Clear Creek County, Park County, the Town of Georgetown, local landowners to discuss the timing of construction activities. The use of staging areas and materials source locations within the corridor will minimize hauling distances (see reference section). For further information see **Section III.b.6c-e.**

C. The project should only focus on repairing the existing surface type and fixing drainage and erosion problems

See subcategory A above for response.

D. The project should only be classified as a rehabilitation project

See Category 29F above for response.

E. Any damage to private property owners in both Park County and Clear Creek County should be compensated by the Federal Highway Administration

Contractors will be liable for damage of private property resulting from construction activities.

FORM LETTERS

The comments also include six form letters as described below. These letters are included in the *Summary of Comments* document.

Form Letter #1

A. Oppose Alternative 6

This comment has been noted and will be considered as part of the official documentation for this project.

B. Oppose all FHWA Alternatives

This comment has been noted and will be considered as part of the official documentation for this project.

C. Alternative 6 does not respond to previous comments

FHWA acknowledges that Alternative 6 does not contain all the design considerations desired by the public. Alternative 6 is FHWA's best attempt to respond to public comments without undermining the engineering industry standards that must be used to design this or any road. FHWA has made it clear at the public hearings held in December 2000 that the rehabilitation-only alternative requested by the public is not feasible, nor a wise use of federal funds. If forced to choose between a rehabilitation-only alternative and the Alternative 1, FHWA would be forced to select Alternative 1.

D. Only acceptable alternative will include:

1) Roadway area to be in current limits of disturbance

See Category 35A above for comment response.

2) No heavy construction, blasting, or hauling through towns/over pass

See Category 35B above for comment response.

3) Only repair the existing surface, fix drainage, and erosion problems

See Category 35A above for comment response.

4) Rehabilitation only

See Category 29F above for comment response.

5) Any damage to private property must be compensated by FHWA

See Category 35E above for comment response.

Form Letter #2

A. Greatly concerned about construction impacts (truck traffic, construction duration, economy, vibration, air quality, noise, quality of life)

Truck traffic

Some construction impacts are anticipated under any of the EIS alternatives during construction activities. However, mitigation measures for truck traffic will be used during construction activities. See reference section for a full description of these mitigation measures.

In addition to the measures in **Section IV.I**, Alternative 6 would require less hauling than Alternatives 2-5 (consistent with a lesser amount of reconstruction and/or paving). For further information see **Sections III.B.6I and IV.I**.

Construction duration

Under the DEIS build alternatives, the worst-case scenario projected construction activities to take place over seven to ten years. Under Alternative 6, the construction in Clear Creek County will be done in two phases and will require no more than three construction seasons for each phase. The construction period on the Park County side will also be done in two phases and will require no more than three construction seasons for each phase.

An option under consideration for mitigation of construction delays includes the location of staging areas within the Guanella Pass Road corridor to reduce the amount of construction truck traffic. This could potentially reduce the construction period as well. For further information see **Section III.B.6c**.

Economy

While construction activities might affect the local economy temporarily during certain periods, measures will be taken to lessen impacts to the area. For further information see **Section III.B.6h**.

Vibration

A vibration study was conducted in Georgetown between June 18, 2001 and July 10, 2001. This study was conducted simultaneously with the placement of test strips of alternative surface types. The preliminary results indicate that the trucks used to conduct these studies did not produce vibrations damaging to historical structures. For further information see **Section III.B.6f**.

Air quality

Air quality impacts in the vicinity of construction are localized and temporary. Dust particles stirred up during construction and vehicle emissions from construction equipment and delayed vehicles will temporarily affect air quality. Pollution levels are not expected to exceed air quality standards. For further information see **Sections III.B.6a and IV.I.1**.

Noise

Noise from construction equipment and operations will impact the residents of Georgetown and Grant, as well as hikers, campers, and tourists in the vicinity of Guanella Pass Road. Impacts will vary depending on the operations taking place and the location of construction during that time. Techniques considered to control noise during construction include restricting noisy construction operations to specific times of the day and specific times of the year and requiring adequate mufflers on all equipment. These measures help eliminate construction noise during sensitive nighttime and early morning hours, and minimize it at other times. For further information see **Sections III.B.6e and IV.I.1**.

Quality of life

Several measures will be used to reduce impacts to the local communities during construction activities. While the quality of life may be lessened for some local residents during these activities,

construction activities would be scheduled in such a way that most of the route will be relatively unaffected in any given time period. For further information see **Section III.B.6I**.

B. Want rehabilitation to be the newly developed alternative

See Category 29F above for response.

C. Do not accept Alternative 6

This comment has been noted and will be considered as part of the official documentation for this project.

Form Letter #3

A. Need “now” solution to a “now” problem, i.e., the issues have changed since the project’s inception and these new issues need to be addressed

While the duration of the project has taken place over a long period of time, each document produced for the Guanella Pass Road EIS contains relevant, updated information. For example, in the DEIS, traffic volumes had been projected through the year 2015 to represent 20-year volumes. In the SDEIS, these volumes were further projected to the year 2025 to represent the updated information relative to the current year of planning for the project.

In addition, new issues identified over time through the public hearing process have been included in subsequent documents, such as winter closure and alternative surface types.

B. Alternative 1 doesn’t solve all problems but it does preserve existing conditions

Existing conditions on Guanella Pass Road would be preserved only for the short-term. Even without construction, traffic is projected to increase, which means that the road surface will continue to deteriorate and erosion and sedimentation will increase. Operational and safety problems will worsen and proper road maintenance will become virtually impossible given the county road budgets. In the long-term, Alternative 1 will not preserve existing conditions; it will only make them worse. For further information see **Section II.B.1**.

C. Issues related to project

1) Construction impacts

Potential construction impacts are anticipated and several mitigation measures have been planned to reduce and/or avoid these impacts to the economy, local traffic, environment, wildlife, etc. For further information see **Sections IV.I.1 and III.B.6**.

Wetland impacts

Based on wetland impacts identified under the DEIS build alternatives, alignments were adjusted to avoid impacts where possible and reduce impacts where they were unavoidable under Alternative 6. It is anticipated that additional adjustments such as minor alignment shifts, steepening fill slopes, and the use of retaining walls will be made during final design to further reduce impacts. See referenced section for a list of measures to be used to mitigate wetland impacts. For further information see **Sections III.B.2b and IV.D.**

2) Endangered species impacts

The BA/BE suggests that the Boreal Toad (Candidate, State Endangered) and Canada Lynx (Federally Threatened, State Endangered) are likely to be adversely affected by any of the build alternatives. The USFWS will be requested to review the mitigation proposed for impacts to these species. Findings also indicate any adverse impacts that occur to FS sensitive species should not substantially affect their viability under any of the alternatives.

A mitigation plan will be implemented to reduce and/or avoid impacts to endangered species. Winter closure could also result in beneficial reduction of potential impacts to wildlife, especially threatened and endangered species. For further information see **Sections III.B.5b and IV.H.**

3) Overuse of wilderness areas

Alternatives formalize established parking areas considered and discourage use of non-formal parking. This will alleviate some of the problems of inappropriate use and overuse.

In addition, interpretive signs developed in concert with the CMS plan will provide information about the natural environment and recreation opportunities in the area and educate people about ways to minimize environmental impacts from recreational uses. Ultimately, how much use a wilderness receives can be controlled by the FS through a permit program and, therefore, extends beyond the FHWA's jurisdiction. For further information see **Section IV.F.**

4) Local citizen safety

As part of the mitigation measures for construction activities, work will be performed in a manner that assures the safety and convenience of the public and protects the residents and property adjacent to the project. The roadway will be maintained in a safe and acceptable condition, including periods when work is not in progress. The contractor will maintain intersections with trails, roads, streets, businesses, parking lots, residences, garages, and other features. Drivers of construction vehicles must follow the same traffic laws as any other citizen. For further information see **Section IV.I.1.**

5) Economy

While construction activities might affect the local economy temporarily during certain phases, measures will be taken to lessen impacts to the area. See reference section for a list of these

measures. Also, Alternative 6 would require less hauling than Alternatives 2-5 (consistent with a lesser amount of reconstruction and/or paving). For further information see **Section III.B.6h**.

6) Pollution – air, noise, and water

Air pollution

Pollution in the area from vehicle emissions would increase in proportion to the traffic increase, but would still not pose any threat to wildlife populations, vegetation, or human populations. For further information see **Section III.C.1**.

Noise

A complete noise analysis was conducted for the Guanella Pass Road improvement project. The existing condition, Alternative 1, and all build alternatives (Alternatives 2-6) were analyzed.

Based on the noise analysis, none of the alternatives produce substantial traffic noise impacts. State transportation agencies do not implement mitigation measures for changes in noise levels of less than 10 to 15 dBA. None of the areas analyzed were projected to experience more than a 5-dBA increase with future traffic projections. It should be noted that along Loop Drive, noise levels are produced primarily by traffic on Interstate 70 and not Guanella Pass Road. No substantial benefit is derived from mitigation of local traffic noise produced by the project. For further information see **Section III.C.2**.

Water pollution

Alternative 6 will improve the existing conditions that degrade the water quality, such as eroding roadway ditches, shoulders, and embankments. The use of BMP's during and after construction, and an aggressive revegetation program, are expected to improve the conditions for water quality. Alternative surface types for the gravel surfaces create a harder surface than reconstructed gravel, which may provide more opportunity for erosion control and reduced sedimentation runoff. For further information see **Sections III.B.1 and IV.I.3**.

Form Letter #4

A. Need “now” solution to a “now” problem, i.e., the issues have changed since the project’s inception and these new issues need to be addressed

See Form Letter #3, Category A above for comment response.

B. Issues related to project

1) Construction impacts

See Form Letter #3, Category C1 above for comment response.

2) Wetland impacts

See Form Letter #3, Category C2 above for comment response.

3) Endangered species impacts

See Form Letter #3, Category C3 above for comment response.

4) Overuse of wilderness areas

See Form Letter #3, Category C4 above for comment response.

5) Local citizen safety

See Form Letter #3, Category C5 above for comment response.

6) Economy

See Form Letter #3, Category C6 above for comment response.

7) Pollution – air, noise, and water

See Form Letter #3, Category C7 above for comment response.

C. Alternative 1 doesn't solve all problems but it does preserve existing conditions

See Form Letter #3, Category B above for comment response.

Form Letter #5

A. Construction affects quality of life

FHWA acknowledges that construction will have a temporary impact on the local citizenry. Several mitigation measures will be used to reduce impacts to the local communities during construction activities. While the quality of life may be lessened for some local residents during these activities, construction activities would be scheduled in such a way that most of the route will be relatively unaffected in any given time period. See **Sections III.B.6I and IV.I** for a complete description of mitigation measures..

B. SDEIS does not thoroughly address safety issues and construction impacts

Alternative 6 was developed to address the many safety issues identified. Some of these include rockslides, protection of hazards, washboarding, and deficient roadway surface. Alternative 6 includes a change in functional classification of the roadway, from a rural collector to a rural local road. This reclassification may increase safety on Guanella Pass Road (compared to the DEIS build alternatives) as the more curvilinear alignment and narrower width, which prevent excessive speeds.

The construction impacts section of the FEIS was expanded substantially to address all construction impacts identified by previous public and agency comments. For further information see **Sections I.C.1c, III.B.6i, and IV.I**.

C. Trade-off of getting road work done isn't worth ruining environment

While some environmental impacts may occur because of construction activities, improvements to the road would mitigate many existing environmental problems in the area. See reference section for issues that would be addressed by improvements. For further information see **Sections I.C and Chapter IV**.

Other measures to prevent impact to natural resources resulting from increased use is the use of guardrail, designated pullouts, and formalized parking areas. These measures will help to control the amount of recreational use in undefined or undesirable areas.

D. Do not accept Alternative 6; want minimum rehabilitation instead

See Category 29F above for response.

Form Letter #6

A. Opposition to Alternative 6

This comment has been noted and will be considered as part of the official documentation for this project.

B. Alternative 6 will destroy the scenic, aesthetic, rural, and rustic nature of the area

Improvements under Alternative 6 have less visual impact on the surrounding area than the DEIS build alternatives. This alternative is intended to retain the visual quality and character of the road. Based on the road character elements defined in **Table III-12**, Alternative 6 is the most consistent of all build alternatives in keeping with the existing character of the road.

The SDEIS also introduced alternative surface types for consideration in roadway design as well as retaining walls, slope treatments, and guardrail design and materials that create an aesthetic design in keeping with the character of the road. For further information see **Sections III.B.1 and III.B.3**.

C. The only acceptable alternative must consist of:

1) Roadway area to be in current limits of disturbance

See Form Letter #1, Category D1 above for comment response.

2) No heavy construction, blasting, or hauling through towns/over pass

See Form Letter #1, Category D2 above for comment response.

3) Only repair the existing surface, fix drainage, and erosion problems

See Form Letter #1, Category D3 above for comment response.

4) Rehabilitation only

See Form Letter #1, Category D4 above for comment response.

5) Any damage to private property must be compensated by FHWA

See Form Letter #1, Category D5 above for comment response.

Petition #1

A summary of the issues addressed in Petition #1 is as follows:

A. Opposition to Alternative 6

This comment has been noted and will be considered as part of the official documentation for this project.

B. Oppose all FHWA alternatives

This comment has been noted and will be considered as part of the official documentation for this project.

C. The only acceptable alternative must consist of:

1) Roadway area to be in current limits of disturbance

See Form Letter #1, Category D1 above for comment response.

2) No heavy construction, blasting, or hauling through towns/over pass

See Form Letter #1, Category D2 above for comment response.

3) Only repair the existing surface, fix drainage, and erosion problems

See Form Letter #1, Category D3 above for comment response.

4) Rehabilitation only

See Form Letter #1, Category D4 above for comment response.

5) Any damage to private property must be compensated by FHWA

See Form Letter #1, Category D5 above for comment response.

Petition #2

The petition expresses an opposition to reconstruction of the road with the need for rehabilitation in Clear Creek County while maintaining the current roadway width and surface type, but improving the drainage and surface quality.

Response:

See Category 29F above for response.

Petition #3 – “Save Guanella Pass”

A. The project funding was first approved ten years ago

The project was approved for available funding beginning in 1993, assuming a build alternative would be selected.

B. The public does not want the project

During the initial scoping and development of the DEIS, some opposition to the project was voiced. As comments were received after the release of the DEIS, several major issues were identified, including the need to develop a new alternative. The majority of commentaries agreed with the need for repair or maintenance of the road, but not to the extent described by the build alternatives in the DEIS. The commentaries indicated that a new alternative should be developed that emphasizes rehabilitation or minimal improvements to Guanella Pass Road. Alternative 6 was developed to be more responsive than Alternatives 2-5 to the environmental setting and the rustic and rural character of the road. For further information see **Section I.B.4**.

C. The Commissioners have had adequate time to study the issue

The Park and Clear Creek County Commissioners have been closely involved in the decision-making process since the inception of the project. By attending meetings, staying updated on all current literature and progress, and learning as much as possible about the project, they will be able to make the most informed decision about the project.

D. \$50 million budget is for ten years of heavy construction and road closure, triple the traffic and increased traffic speeds, increased accidents and injuries, destruction of wildlife habitat, and \$5 million cost to the County and endless lawsuits

Construction period

Under the DEIS build alternatives, the worst-case scenario projected that construction activities would take place over seven to ten years. Alternative 6 was developed in an effort to address the many concerns, including the impact that the construction seasons will have on the community. Under Alternative 6, the construction in Clear Creek County will be done in two phases and will require no more than three construction seasons for each phase. The construction period on the Park County side will also be done in two phases and will require no more than three construction seasons for each phase. Construction staging has not yet been determined. The FHWA will plan phases of construction in coordination with the Counties and local communities. For further information see **Section III.B.6c**.

Increased traffic volumes and speeds

Under the Alternative 1, traffic volumes are projected to increase approximately 56 percent by 2025. The improvements to the roadway under Alternative 6 increase traffic volumes over Alternative 1 levels by 20 percent at the summit. Because of the sharper curvature, narrower

roadway width, and lower speed limits, traffic volumes are not expected to increase as much under Alternative 6 compared to Alternatives 2-5. For further information see **Section III.B.1b**.

Accidents and injuries

Accident rates on Guanella Pass Road are notably higher than the accident rates on similar hard-surface recreational roads. Many safety deficiencies on the existing roadway create a high accident potential. The hazards created by these safety deficiencies, and left as they now exist with Alternative 1, will become an increasing problem as traffic volumes increase. For further information see **Section I.C.1c**.

Wildlife habitat

The extent of habitat disturbance and wildlife displacement under Alternative 6 is reduced in comparison to the DEIS build alternatives. Roadkill is projected to be reduced in comparison to the other DEIS build alternatives as a result of lower design speed and lower traffic volumes anticipated for Alternative 6. This is partially offset by poorer sight distances compared to alternatives with more full reconstruction. Several mitigation measures for wildlife habitat impacts will become elements of the selected alternative.

If implemented, winter closure would reduce direct/indirect impacts of the road on wildlife. For further information see **Sections III.B.5 and IV.G**.

Costs to Counties

Under Alternative 6, maintenance costs would be 64 percent of the Alternative 1 costs over a 20-year period. This is due to the increased life cycle of the improved roadway. For further information see **Section III.C.11**.

Lawsuits/litigation

Costs for litigation that may or may not result from the project cannot be estimated.

Petition #4

Petition #4 states opposition to reconstruction due to the following factors:

A. Takes away the rustic and primitive character of the road and its surrounding areas

Alternative 6 was presented after the public's comments on Alternatives 2-5. Alternative 6 was created to preserve the existing beauty and character of the road by providing a more environmentally and aesthetically sensitive alternative.

Improvements under Alternative 6 cause less visual impacts to the surrounding area. This alternative is intended to retain the visual quality and character of the road. Based on the road character elements defined in **Table III-12**, Alternative 6 is the most consistent in keeping with the existing character of the road.

The SDEIS also introduced alternative surface types for consideration in roadway design as well as retaining walls, slope treatments, guardrail design and materials that create an aesthetic design in keeping with the character of the road. For further information see **Section III.B.3**.

B. Inappropriate use of Guanella Pass Road would be encouraged

Measures to prevent impact to natural resources resulting from increased and/or inappropriate use include the use of designated pullouts, guardrail, and formalized parking areas. These measures will help to control the amount of recreational use in undefined or undesirable areas. Ultimately, use of lands adjacent to Guanella Pass Road falls within the land management agency jurisdiction, not the FHWA. For further information see **Section III.B.4a**.

C. Serious destructive impacts on wildlife

The extent of habitat disturbance and wildlife displacement under Alternative 6 is reduced in comparison to Alternatives 2-5. Roadkill is projected to be reduced in comparison to the other DEIS build alternatives as a result of lower design speed and lower traffic volumes anticipated for Alternative 6. This is partially offset by poorer sight distances compared to alternatives with more full reconstruction. Several mitigation measures for wildlife habitat impacts will become elements of the selected alternative (see reference section). If implemented, winter closure would reduce direct/indirect impacts of the road on wildlife. For further information see **Sections III.B.5 and IV.G**.

D. Up to nine acres of wetlands would be destroyed

Wetland impacts for Alternatives 2-5 are greater than under Alternative 6. Alternatives 2 and 3 have the greatest impact at 2.96 hectares (7.32 acres). Alternative 6 has approximately 0.28 hectare (0.71 acre) of impact. However, it is anticipated that additional adjustments will be made during final design to further reduce wetland impacts. Any wetland impacts will be mitigated by the restoration of wetlands as approved by the EPA and the USACE. For further information see **Sections III.B.2b and IV.D**.

E. Noise

See Form Letter #3, Category D7 above for response.

F. Paving and widening the Guanella Pass Road does not equal a safer road

Alternative 6 partially improves the safety of the roadway. The reconstructed sections provide consistent geometry, improved sight distances, improved rockfall mitigation, and provision for vehicle pullouts.

In addition to the improved safety of the roadway, the lower design speed and curvilinear alignment of the road under Alternative 6 will prevent vehicles from traveling at excessive speeds. For further information see **Section I.C.1c**.

Petition #5

Petition #5 expresses opposition to reconstruction with the following ideas mentioned:

A. Improving not in best long-range interests of Clear Creek County

The existing roadway has safety and maintenance issues that would be in the best long-range interests of Clear Creek County to address. Alternative 6 improves the safety of the roadway. The reconstructed sections provide improvements such as consistent geometry, improved sight distances, improved rockfall protection, and provision for vehicle pullouts.

The cost of maintenance of the road after construction of Alternative 6 for 20 years is 64 percent of the cost of maintenance for Alternative 1. Maintenance cost estimates assume that the road-surfaces are maintained to a level consistent with standard recommended practices, preferred surface conditions, and projected traffic volumes. Long-term costs to maintain the road would be less expensive for the counties under Alternative 6. For further information see **Sections I.C.1c and III.C.11**.

B. Need to say no to rapid sprawl

Rapid sprawl is not an issue with the proposed project given that only a small amount of land along Guanella Pass Road is privately owned. Historic Georgetown or the Historic District Public Lands Commission holds much of the private land near Georgetown and the Georgetown Reservoir for the purpose of protecting it from development. As a result, improving the road will cause little additional development in the corridor.

Potential secondary impacts to land use include increased tourist-oriented and recreation development. However, because Georgetown and Silver Plume are in historic districts, some controls such as the recently passed revised zoning regulations in Georgetown are in effect to determine the style and type of development or redevelopment that may occur within these towns.

Future development, either commercial or residential, will be regulated by the local land management agencies to be consistent with the rural local road functional classification. For further information see **Sections III.B.1c and III.B.1e**.

C. Few historic towns remaining

Alternative 6 is anticipated to have less traffic and requires less construction hauling within the Historic Landmark District than the DEIS build alternatives. The narrow roadway width and sharp curve radii in the Georgetown area reduce the visual impact to Leavenworth Mountain and the District.

Retaining walls, careful blasting techniques, rock-cut stain, and revegetation will be used to minimize visual impacts to Section 4(f) Resources. For a more detailed list of measures to minimize impacts to historic resources, see reference section. For further information see **Section IV.K**.

D. Too much- too soon development will make us lose mountains

See Petition #4, Category A above for response.

E. We are becoming “Californicated”

This comment has been noted and will be considered as part of the official documentation for this project.

F. Won’t know what we have until it’s gone

This comment has been noted and will be considered as part of the official documentation for this project.

Petition #6

Petition #6 was submitted by a group of glass artists. Commentaries expressed a desire for improvements to the roadway based on the following reasons:

A. People are inspired by the beauty of the mountains and require safe travel

The build alternatives developed for this project are intended to provide safety improvements for Guanella Pass Road by correcting deficient roadway conditions and accommodating existing and projected future traffic volumes.

B. Guanella Pass is very dangerous

See section A above.

C. Improving/paving will make the drive more comfortable and safer for everyone

See section A above.

Petition #7

Petition #7 was signed by business owners in Georgetown expressing opposition to reconstruction of the road. These business owners urge the pursuit of rehabilitation in Clear Creek County, maintaining the current roadway width and surface type, but improving the drainage and surface quality.

Response:

See Form Letter #1, Category D1 for response.

Petition #8

Petition #8 also expresses opposition to reconstruction:

A. Opposition to Alternative 6

This comment has been noted and will be considered as part of the official documentation for this project.

B. Oppose all FHWA alternatives

This comment has been noted and will be considered as part of the official documentation for this project.

C. The only acceptable alternative must consist of:

1) Roadway area to be in current roadway width

See Form Letter #1, Category D1 above for comment response.

2) No heavy construction, blasting, or hauling through towns/over pass

See Form Letter #1, Category D2 above for comment response.

3) Only repair the existing surface, fix drainage, and erosion problems

See Form Letter #1, Category D3 above for comment response.

4) Rehabilitation only

See Form Letter #1, Category D4 above for comment response.

5) Any damage to private property must be compensated by FHWA

See Form Letter #1, Category D5 above for comment response.

Petition #9

Petition #9 expresses opposition to reconstruction of the road as proposed by the FHWA. The petition urges the pursuit of rehabilitation in Clear Creek County, maintaining the current roadway width and surface type, but improving the drainage and surface quality.

Response:

See Form Letter #1, Category D1 for response.

Petition #10

Petition #10 expresses opposition to all of the construction alternatives including Alternative 6. The petition states that none of the alternatives reflect the requests of the public. The only acceptable alternative that maintains the rural and rustic nature of Guanella Pass as requested by the public must consist of the following:

A. Eliminate all full reconstruction and realignment

See Form Letter #1, Category D1 for response.

B. Retain the roadway slope, neighboring slopes, and old growth

It is not considered a wise investment of resources to perform road improvements that soon will become inadequate or inappropriate, such as to further reduce the proposed width, resurface the road without widening the narrowest portions, or not correct the most deficient alignment and geometric inconsistencies. The most hazardous conditions would be left unaddressed and may leave the counties, the FS, and the FHWA with a facility having many operational, maintenance, and safety liabilities. For further information see **Section II.D.4.**

C. Use natural materials on accompanying road structures and leave the unpaved surfaces unpaved

Improvements under Alternative 6 are less visually impacting to the surrounding area than the DEIS build alternatives. This alternative is intended to retain the visual quality and character of the road. Improvements to the roadway also include alternative surface types for consideration in roadway design as well as retaining walls, slope treatments, and guardrail design and materials that create an aesthetic design in keeping with the character of the road. For further information see **Sections II.B.6, II.G and III.B.3.**

D. Focus only on repairing existing surface type and fixing drainage and erosion problems

See Form Letter #1, Category D1 for response.

E. Construction impacts on communities and the Guanella Pass Road area must be very limited

Several mitigation measures will be used to reduce impacts to the local communities during construction activities. While the quality of life may be lessened for some local residents during these activities, construction activities would be scheduled in such a way that most of the route will be relatively unaffected in any given time period. See **Sections III.B.6I and IV.I.1** for a list of mitigation measures for construction impacts.

F. If changes to the design cannot be limited to maintenance improvements to the existing road surface, then we would like the FHWA to choose Alternative 1

This comment has been noted and will be considered as part of the official documentation for this project.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK